THE CHURCHMAN.

Vol. XIII.—No. 46. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii. 15. Whole Number 670.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1844. BY JAMES A. SPARKS, 109 NASSAU-ST. Terms—$3 00 per annum in advance.

POETRY.

For the Churchman.

ECCLESIA.

I love Her, and I love to dwell
Upon Her spotless fame;
Nor doth it make me blush, to tell
Her blessed, holy Name.
For sweeter than the sweetest tones
That in our dreams we hear;
Than dearest word Affection owns
It falls upon the ear.

And She is fairer than the moon
Sleeping on bed of snow—
More glorious than the blaze of noon—
Or sunset's brilliant glow.
Full of all pleasures are Her ways,
Yet innocent the while—
And o'er Her brow the beauty plays
Of many a holy smile.

And O! so musical Her voice,
So soft its cadences;
We deem the Angels do rejoice
With such sweet harmonies.
Its tones—where'er we move along
She wakes them with a lay;
With holy word, or gentle song
Beguiling all the way.

And tis, because as Comforter
Time's pathway She doth press;
That every age hath christened Her
With Name of blessedness.
That with high laud and gloria
Men noble, faithful, good,
Have cried—Sancta Ecclesia!
As round Her form they stood.

I love—and blush not to avow
Her blessed, holy Name—
To bear Her mark upon my brow,
Her praises to proclaim.
And well I know She loveth me,
That She, The Undefiled,
Doth o'er me watch continually,
As Mother o'er Her child.

Nor deem ye, that a jealous glow
Would in my bosom burn;
If ye, who scoffing, pass Her now,
Should for Her favor yearn.
Or, humbly suing at Her feet
If, She with tender gaze
Should, mid Her smiles, your coming greet,
With kiss and fond embrace.

Alas! I often weep to think
That any turn away;
Nor will the living waters drink
That in Her fountains play.
Weep over all tossed to and fro
By error's every blast,
Strangers to peace—who never know
The quiet round Her cast.

And plead for those whose wand'ring feet
The parched deserts burn;
Who from Her still, secure retreat
In blinded frenzy turn;
Who mock the voice that bids them, come—
Reject Her proffered hand;
And rush in madness from their home
To perish in the sand.

Alas for them! My song shall dwell
Upon Her spotless fame;
Nor doth it make me blush to tell
Ecclesia! Thy Name.
For sweeter than the sweetest tones
That in our dreams we hear,
Than fondest word Affection owns
It falls upon the ear.

Then whisper it to every gale,
Breathe it in every song,
Till hill and plain and lowly vale
Ecclesia prolong.
Proclaim it with the Organ's sound,
With hymn and gloria—
To every nation swell it round—
Sancta Ecclesia.

Feast of Circumcision. 1844. H. M. D. Va.

From Bishop Hobart's Apology.

EPISCOPACY VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGE OF ARROGANCE, &c.

Do I maintain that ***God will not dispense with communion with the Episcopal priesthood***, when I express my belief that he will dispense with it in the cases of all those who do not "*negligently* or *wilfully* continue in a state of separation from it;" who do not, through criminal *negligence* or *wilful obstinacy*, contemn the means of arriving at the truth, and resist the light of conviction? Or do I maintain that "separation from the Episcopal priesthood renders faith and repentance unavailing, and mars the religion of non-Episcopalians," when I express my belief that the "humble, the penitent, and obedient," who reject the authorized ministry, not "*negligently* or *wilfully*," but through "*involuntary error*," will still have "mercy" extended to them? Am I guilty then of making the "only alternative, Episcopacy or Perdition?" When my principles thus extend mercy to many who reject that "external order" which I believe has the sanction of divine authority, do I make "external order the hinging point of salvation?" Do I "place this order on a level with the merits of Christ," when the principle which I lay at the foundation of my work is, "that we are saved from the guilt and dominion of sin by the divine merits and grace of a crucified Redeemer?" Is my making (according to you) "faith in Christ of secondary, and Episcopacy of primary importance," consistent with your own declaration of the "evangelical strain" of many parts of the book? And while I expressly acknowledge that the "humble, the penitent, and obedient," even though they should, through "involuntary error," reject the authorized ministry, and of course the Bishop, will enjoy the "blessings of God's favor"—is your assertion correct, that I "make faith in Christ impossible but through communion with the Bishop?" You may say indeed, that I "flinch from the *consequences* of my own doctrine." By and by, I shall consider this point, and show that you are as incorrect and uncandid in deducing consequences as you are in stating opinions. My simple object now is to show that *I do not hold the obnoxious opinions* which you impute to me. For, to use your own language, I "am sure that the *drift*, and have little doubt that the *design*," of your review "is to force plain people into the conclusion," that I *really* maintain the opinions which, by most unfair deduction from my writings, you fix upon me.

What, according to your representations, is the amount of my reasonings? That *all are consigned to* "PERDITION" who are not within the pale of my own Church. No persons will believe that I am capable of pronouncing this most impious judgment, when they read the following, contained in the very books on which you animadvert: "The Judge of the whole earth will do right. The grace of God quickens and animates *all the degenerate children of Adam.* The mercy of the Saviour is co-extensive with the ruin into which sin hath plunged mankind. And in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." "*We presume to judge no man*, leaving all judgment to that *Being* who is alone qualified to make allowance for the *ignorance, invincible prejudices, imperfect reasonings*, and *mistaken judgments* of his frail creatures." "*All men* are in the hands of an infinitely *merciful* and righteous God, who will *judge them according to their works.*" "Though the institutions of the Almighty are indispensably binding upon men, he is not himself restricted by them. Every benevolent heart, therefore, ardently cherishes the delightful belief that *mercy will at length* be extended to *all who humbly and earnestly seek to know and to do the will* of their heavenly Master." Episcopalians maintain, that "in conformity to the order handed down from the beginning, Bishops only have the power of ordination, and as a *general* proposition they maintain that Episcopal ministrations only are valid. At the same time they are disposed to believe, that when any Church cannot obtain the lawful succession, God, who 'is not a hard master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strawed,' will mercifully dispense with it. Nay, that he will graciously accept and bless the ministrations of those who have not a lawful call; when the error is not chargeable to wilful neglect of the means of information, nor to obstinate resistance to the light of conviction. In this way does the author of the 'Companion for the Altar' reconcile truth with charity; in this way does he embrace in the arms of fraternal benevolence all who, according to the talents bestowed on them by their gracious Maker, seek to know and to do his will."

Will you hold sentiments equally *charitable* with those which I have advanced in the foregoing extracts? Will you, "in the sincerity of your soul," cherish the delightful hope of that "glorious consummation—when the same generous zeal for God and truth, which too often, in this world of folly and confusion, sets those at widest variance whom the similitude of virtuous feelings should the most unite, shall be the cement of an indissoluble friendship; when the innumerable multitude of all nations, kindreds, and people, (why should I not add of all sects and parties?) assembled round the throne, shall, like the first Christians, be of one soul, and one mind; giving praise with one consent to him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb that was slain to redeem them by his blood?" No, sir, I will venture to say that you will not meet me on this broad ground of charity, which extends the favor of God to all his sincere servants, whatever may be their unintentional and involuntary errors. I will venture to pledge myself that anxious as you are to represent me as hurling to perdition all who are not within the pale of my own Church, your charity will not take this wide range. For, referring to some of the charitable opinions which are above expressed, you intimate, "that in maintaining them, if a little pressed, I might perhaps find I had no ingenuity to spare." Come, sir, press me on these assertions. The public will soon see who it is that maintains positions "arrogant, extravagant," and revolting to common sense and reason.

But you will say, I "flinch from the consequences of my own doctrines"—"my concessions are in diametrical repugnance to my arguments."

I proceed, therefore, to prove that you support your charges by *partial* and *false* views of my opinions; by uncandidly *torturing* them to an extreme; and by illogical deductions unworthy of a just and candid reasoner. I shall show that the same uncandid methods would attach the same odium to many of your own principles on the subject of Church communion; and that I lay no greater stress on external order, on communion with the Churh through its ministry and ordinances, than the standards and confessions of faith of the Presbyterian Churches will warrant.

From the criminality of rejecting that ministry which has alone the seal of divine authority, I expressly and repeatedly except all who labor under "involuntary error." But this "relief," you say, "is not worth accepting," because "the instances in which it would be substantiated, would be rare indeed." And this position you established by falsely representing me as confounding together what are totally distinct, "*unavoidable* error," and "*involuntary* error." *Unavoidable error* can only be committed where there is no "access to the means of instruction." But *involuntary error* may be committed even where instruction sheds the full blaze of light. They fall within the exception of *unavoidable error*, who *have not* access to the means of *information.* And they fall within the exception of *involuntary error*, who, possessing the means of investigating truth, do not *neglect* these means, nor *wilfully* resist the light of conviction. These two excusable kinds of error will include all the sincere inquirers after truth; who, I expressly admit, will not be condemned for rejecting the divinely authorized priesthood. Separation from this priesthood I make excusable, whenever "it proceeds from *involuntary and unavoidable ignorance or error.* Now, sir, what is the construction which common sense and common candor would put upon my language? Certainly that in my judgment THEY are excusable for *rejecting* the authorized ministry of the Church, who either do not possess the means of information, or are prevented from availing themselves of these means—for their *ignorance* is *unavoidable* and *involuntary.* That THEY are excusable who remain in *error* on the subject, through the imperfect means of information in their power—for their *error* is evidently *unavoidable.* That THEY are excusable who, neither *neglecting* the means of information, nor *wilfully* resisting the light of conviction, remain still in error—for their error is *involuntary*, is neither negligent nor wilful; and must be referred to that power of prejudice, to that force of early prepossessions, or to some of those inscrutable causes which, we know, often blind the understandings and pervert the judgments of the greatest and best of men. You were bound in common justice and candor, as well as by the obvious meaning of terms, to place the above construction on my language. In the very passage of my writings which you have quoted, I fix the imputation of "great guilt" and "imminent danger" on those only "who *negligently* or *wilfully* continue in a state of separation from the duly authorized ministry of the Church"—*negligently*, through inattention to the subject—*wilfully*, through resistance to the honest conviction of their minds.

Whom then do I exempt from what you are pleased to term my "sweeping sentence of proscription?" I exempt from the guilt of rejecting the authorized ministry of the Church, the thousands who do not possess the means of investigating the subject; or are prevented by their situation and peculiar circumstances from pursuing the investigation—their *ignorance* is *unavoidable* and *involuntary.* I exempt the thousands of "humble, penitent, and obedient" Christians, who, possessing only imperfect means of information, or after an *honest* and *diligent* examination, continue still in a state of "separation from the authorized ministry"—their error is not occasioned by *negligence*—it is not *wilful*—it is *involuntary*; and, therefore, in the eye of a just and merciful Judge, *excusable.* What charity, I demand, can be more extensive? To your ingenuity in distorting my opinions, and placing a false construction on my language, I am willing to do homage. And did not the subject concern the infinitely momentous truths of religion, I might be disposed to allow you the gratification of displaying, in the arts of distortion and false deduction, talents, which, I confess, in my opinion, are unrivalled. But when the object of these arts is to fix on me the execrable and impious imputation of rendering, in regard to non-Episcopalians, "repentance towards God, faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, conformity to his image, and zeal for his glory, of no avail;" when it is the object of these arts to represent me as holding opinions which "mar the religion of non-Episcopalians, and render it stark naught," and which make the "only alternative, Episcopacy or Perdition!!"—when by these arts of distortion and false deduction you brand me with the odious criminality of maintaining "positions of deep-toned horror"—I am justified, I am compelled, by the most sacred principles of duty, to resist and expose these arts, as in the extreme, ungenerous and cruel.

In admitting that *involuntary error* absolves from guilt, I have prepared a broad shield of charity which will cover all the sincere inquirers after truth. *Involuntary* error arises from *mistaken judgment*, and leaves the *heart* sincerely desirous to embrace the *truth.* It is, therefore, compatible with the most sincere attachment to truth, and the most diligent investigation of it. And unless you will maintain the perfectibility of human reason; unless you will disdain the supposition that in any corner of your heart lurks some dominant prejudice or passion which may obscure or mislead your researches, permit me to observe, that distinguished as may be your attainments, and soaring as may be your powers, you too must take refuge under that shield of involuntary error which you so contemptuously reject. When the humiliating conviction of the weakness of the human mind, and the power of prejudice, overwhelms me with doubt and apprehension, the firm persuasion, that my merciful Judge will not impute involuntary error to me as a crime, is my hope and solace. The contrary supposition, revolting to every principle of justice, is instantly repelled by every view which reason or Scripture affords us of the goodness, mercy, and justice of that almighty Being who "knoweth whereof we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust." "He is not a hard master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strawed." "And where a man has a willing mind, he is accepted according to what he has, and not according to what he has not." "The charity then of Mr. H. and his brethren," is not without "warrant." The mercy which rests on this charity is not "precarious."

You place a false construction on the following passage: "But where the Gospel is proclaimed, communion with the Church by the participation of its ordinances at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood, is the *indispensable condition of salvation.*" You surely are not ignorant that a condition of salvation may be considered as indispensable, either with respect to God, who imposes the condition, or with respect to MAN, on whom the condition is imposed. There are certain conditions of salvation which the Almighty himself will not *dispense with.* He will not, for instance, dispense with holiness—For "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." There are other conditions of salvation, in regard to which, though *man* does not possess the right of dispensation, we may be assured, that in certain cases, a merciful and sovereign *God* will exercise this right. Of this description are all the *positive institutions* of religion; among which are the Church, its ministry and ordinances. When, therefore, in the sentence above quoted, I rank "communion with the Church through its duly authorized ministry," as an "indispensable condition of salvation," my meaning evidently is, that MAN has no authority to *dispense* with this condition, to fulfil it or not as he pleases; for, in the very next sentence, which is in *connection* with the former, I express the belief, that God *will*, in certain cases, *dispense with* this condition. And I applied the term indispensable to communion with the authorized ministry, in order to oppose the opinion too commonly entertained, that the ministry of the Church may be *dispensed* with, or altered, as *man* may please; and that, of course, communion with the ministry originally constituted by Christ and his Apostles, is a matter of no moment. * * * There are certain cases in which you will acknowledge that Christians are absolved from the duty of frequent communion. And there are also cases in which I maintain that they are absolved, in the sight of God, from the guilt of rejecting the authorized ministry. It would indeed be absurd to say, that "an indispensable condition may be dispensed with"—if the terms be applied in one and the same sense. But surely "a condition *indispensable*," as it respects *man's* authority or right, may yet be "*dispensed with*" by that *God* who is supreme in authority and power. What now, sir, becomes of your attempt to make my only alternative "contradiction or crime?" What becomes of your attempt, by perverting my language to a meaning different from that in which my explicit declarations should have led you to understand it, to fix on me the odious and impious imputation of "making the only alternative, EPISCOPACY or *Perdition!!*"

You charge me with "placing the external order of the Church upon a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus in the article of acceptance with God." It is the least of the criminality of such a tenet, that it "wounds the bosom of tender piety." In imputing it to me, you overwhelm me with the awful guilt of derogating from the supreme efficacy of that precious blood which alone shields the sinner from the wrath of an offended God. In the *sense* in which *you* understand the term "*indispensable*," I would not apply it to either *faith* or *external order.* Where the gospel is proclaimed, faith in Christ, and communion with that visible body of which he is the head, and which he redeems and sanctifies, are conditions with which *man* has no authority to *dispense.* As, however, I have repeatedly expressed the belief that *God* will *dispense*, in cases of involuntary error, with what I consider regular and valid communion with the Church, it is evident that I do not place "external order and faith in Christ" upon a level. But grant that I make them in the same sense indispensable: does it follow that I "place external order on a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus?" May I not consistently maintain that these all-sufficient merits are the only grounds of the acceptance of our faith, and also of our obedience to that external order which God has prescribed? In your zeal to fix on me the blasphemous doctrine, that *obedience* to *external order* is of as much avail to salvation, as "the merits of our Lord Jesus," you evidently place "*faith*" on a level with these merits. On the supposition that I make "soundness in external order" an indispensable condition of salvation, I am guilty, according to you, of placing external order on a level with the merits of Christ. Therefore, as you make *faith* an *indispensable* condition, nay "the hinging point of salvation," by your own reasoning it follows, that you place *faith* "on a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus in the article of acceptance with God"—that is, *faith*, which (though it be formed in the soul by divine grace) is an act of the understanding and the will, and therefore a *human performance*, as much so as "*soundness in external order*," has as great influence towards our salvation as "the *merits of the Lord Jesus!!*" I mean not, however, to impute this position to you. But you must take your choice—either acknowledge that your reasoning against me is fallacious, or incur the censure of placing *human performances* on a level with the merits of Christ. Whether these performances be *faith*, or *soundness in external order*, is of no consequence. God forbid that I should depreciate faith as a Christian grace, or attempt to lower its rank among the conditions of salvation. But it is surely impious to place *any qualifications in the creature*, even though they may be wrought in him (as faith certainly is) through the agency of the Holy Spirit, upon a "level with *the merits of Christ* in the article of acceptance with God."

I complain, that in your attempt to fix on me the imputation of making "Episcopacy of primary, and faith of secondary importance," you have materially misstated a passage in my writings. This passage you thus introduce: "We are told again, that 'whoever IS in communion with the bishop, the supreme governor of the Church upon earth, IS in communion with Christ the head of it; and whoever IS NOT in communion with the bishop, is thereby cut off from communion with Christ,' and this is said to be a 'general conclusion' 'established' by 'the uniform' testimony of ALL the apostolic and primitive writers." Now, the passage which you *dissever* and *alter*, and the parts of which you *arrange* to suit your own purposes, is as follows: "The uniform *testimony* of all the apostolic and primitive writers establishes the general conclusion, that whoever WAS in communion with the bishop, the supreme governor of the Church upon earth, WAS in communion with Christ the head of it; and whoever WAS not in communion with the bishop, WAS thereby cut off from communion with Christ." The difference is striking and material. According to your quotation of this passage, you make me state a *doctrine* of my own, in *terms* of my own choice. Whereas, the passage as it stands in the Festivals and Fasts, and in Daubeny, from which it is taken, states an *historical fact*, that such WAS the opinion of the APOSTOLIC and PRIMITIVE WRITERS. The difference, I say, is striking and material. For in the passage as you state it, I am answerable not merely for the doctrine *intended* to be conveyed, but for the *language* also; which, in such ingenious hands as yours, may be twisted and perverted to a dangerous and erroneous construction. But in the passage, as it appears in Daubeny, and in the Festivals and Fasts, the Apostolic and primitive writers alone are answerable for the *terms* in which they convey their doctrine. And as it was your object, from this passage, to raise in your readers that "gaze of astonishment or swell of indignation" which held you "in suspense," "after perusing it"—it was unwarrantable in you to distort and alter the passage, and change the arrangement of the parts.

The primitive fathers believed what the Presbyterian confessions of faith assert, that "out of the *visible Church* there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." And as they knew no Church without a bishop at the head of it, of course they were compelled to conclude, that there was no "*ordinary possibility* of salvation" but through the bishop. The only difference between you and them is, that they believed there could be no *visible* Church but where there was a bishop; and you believe a "perfect equality in the ministry" to be the principle of Church unity. You both agree that *visible communion* with Christ is maintained by *communion with the Church*, through baptism and the Lord's supper. For, according to the Presbyterian confessions of faith, these ordinances were instituted "to put a *visible* difference between *those* who *belong* unto the *Church* and the *rest of the world.*"

Your confounding this *visible* communion with Christ through his Church, with that *spiritual* communion which commences in true faith, but which must be "sealed" and "nourished" by the ordinances of the Church, has led you to represent me as maintaining that "there is no access to communion with Christ but through the bishop;" and that "faith in Christ is impossible where there is no communion with the bishop." That there can be no *visible* communion with Christ but through the bishop, I undoubtedly maintain. For, on Episcopal principles, none but a bishop can give a valid commission to administer those *ordinances* on which this visible communion depends. But *spiritual* communion with Christ, that communion whereby we spiritually discern his gracious offices, and apply them to our souls, depends upon the exercise of genuine faith. While, therefore, I maintain that "true faith vitally unites its possessor to Christ," I can consistently maintain, that this communion must be "sealed," must be "confirmed," by communion with the Church through its duly authorized ministers; and that he who *wilfully* rejects this communion with the visible Church, "out of which there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation," will forfeit those blessings to which his communion with Christ by faith would otherwise entitle him. What God hath joined together let not man put asunder. *Baptism* and the *Lord's supper* are, on Presbyterian principles, the "seals of the covenant." And can he lay any claim to the blessings of this covenant who wilfully rejects its "holy seals?" If he can, to what purpose serve these seals? And if he cannot, as these "seals" are, on Presbyterian principles, "not to be dispensed by any but a *minister* of the word, *lawfully ordained*," does not *communion with Christ*, through the "seals" of the covenant, depend, yourself being judge, on *communion* with *lawful ministers?* The only difference between us then is on the question, Who are *lawful ministers?* We both agree that by true faith the believer becomes interested in the blessings of the covenant; but that to these blessings (cases of unavoidable ignorance and involuntary error excepted) he can have no regular title before they are sealed and confirmed to him in those divine ordinances which Christ instituted to be the "*means* whereby we receive these blessings," "and a *pledge* to assure us thereof."

Nor is your charge just, that I lessen the importance of faith. On my principles, without *true faith* all external communion with Christ through his Church can be of no avail, and will only tend to our greater condemnation. I assert that to the "BELIEVER" only are "the merits and grace of the Redeemer applied, in the *devout* and *humble* participation of the *ordinances* of the Church, administered by a priesthood, who derive their authority, by regular transmission from Christ." "Pardon, salvation, and grace, the inestimable blessings of this sacred ordinance (the Lord's supper) are conveyed only to the TRUE BELIEVER." Communion with the Church is the appointed mode by which the *faith* and obedience of Christians is to be quickened and preserved, and made acceptable unto God. But unless their communion with the Church conduces to this end, and advances them into a conformity to Christ their holy and divine head, it is not sincere, and will not be effectual to their salvation. Those who, admitted into the Church, live in a course of sin and disobedience, will incur the heavy condemnation of having *resisted God's grace*, of having *done despite unto his spirit*, of having contemned the offers of divine mercy, and counted the *blood of the covenant an unholy thing.*" So far then from your accusation being just, that I "hold up Episcopacy as of primary, and faith in Christ as of secondary importance;" on the contrary, I make all effectual or beneficial communion with the bishop to depend on faith; and, agreeably to your own conclusion, "that the one upon which the existence of the other depends must be the more important of the two," I make, of course, faith in Christ of more importance than communion with the bishop. This communion with the bishop can take place only through baptism and the Lord's supper, dispensed by ministers Episcopally ordained. And for baptism in the case of adults, and for the Lord's supper, faith is a preparatory, an essential qualification. As, therefore, on my principles, faith *precedes* communion with the bishop, it is *distinct from* this communion, and *independent* of it. How then can I be accused of making "faith impossible where there is no communion with the bishop," and of holding principles which make "all non-Episcopalians, of necessity, infidels?" All your ingenious reasoning, which appears to have cost you so much labor, and by which you attempt to justify your odious charges against me, is founded on an uncandid construction of my language, on consequences *unfairly* deduced from my principles.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—A highly esteemed friend, who in the religious slang cant of the day, is no "Puseyite," lately presented me with a copy of "Cecil's Remains," (Carter, 1843,) with the condition that I should read it. I have done so, and met with sayings in it, rather surprising to me, all things considered. Mr. Cecil, if I mistake not, is of "authority" in certain quarters, where "Tractarianism" is regarded as "evil, and nothing but evil," and "authority"—at least, of the Church and of the Fathers—is scouted. Of course, I expected to meet with sentiments *entirely* opposed to those of the "Oxford Divines," but have been disappointed, there being many points of agreement, as, with your permission, I will proceed to show. Without reading the book, you might infer its anti-Romanizing "tendencies," and rightly; for Mr. C. says of Popery, that, "It is, in truth, the mystery of iniquity."—*Remains, p.* 131.

Well, Mr. Froude says, "the Romanists are wretched Tridentines, everywhere"—"idolators," &c.—*Puseyism no Popery, p.* 11.

Devotional Habits. "The leading defect of Christian ministers is a want of a Devotional Habit. The Church of Rome made much of this habit. The contests accompanying and following the Reformation, with something of an indiscriminate enmity against some of the good of that Church as well as the evil, combined to repress this spirit in the Protestant writings; whereas, the *mind of Christ* seems, in fact, to be the grand end of Christianity in its operation upon man."—*Remains, pp.* 115, 116.

Extremes. "Because Papists have made too much of some things, Protestants have made too little of them. The papists treat a man as all sense; and therefore, some Potestants would treat him as all spirit. Because one party has exalted the Virgin Mary to a divinity, the other can scarcely think of the *most highly favored among women* with common respect. The papist puts the Apocrypha into his canon; the Protestant will scarcely regard it as an ancient record. The popish heresy of human merit in justification, drove Luther on the other side into most unwarrantable and unscriptural statements of that doctrine. The papists consider grace as inseparable from the participation of the sacraments; the Protestants too often lose sight of them as instituted means of conveying grace."—*Remains, p.* 221.

"Nothing is more remarkable in the theology of the Reforming age, (to speak generally,) than the deficiency of all writings of a devotional, or even a practical cast. Did not one know that many of the divines of that period were serious, earnest-minded men, an ill-natured person might almost suspect that, as their sermons were certainly philippics, so their very prayers were anathemas. Let us hope better things; and that had the private devotions of these sturdy champions of the Reformed doctrine come down to us, they would be found * * * to breathe many a secret prayer for the purification of that Branch of the Church Catholic, which they felt themselves constrained to charge with corruption of the faith; and for the *supply* of *deficiencies* in that which they were laboring, as in duty bound, to defend."

We are "fully disposed to make allowances for him, (Bp Jewel,) on the score, as well of the very trying situation in which he and his brethren were placed, as of the coarseness of the age in which his lot was cast. And assuredly, as far as language goes, he is even mild in comparison with his Roman antagonist." (Harding.)—*Brit. Crit. July*, 1841, *pp.* 34.

Grace of Congruity. "As to the Roman Catholic notion of a grace of congruity in their sense of it, I utterly disclaim it. Some of the best of them taught that God prepared the heart for himself in various unseen ways. And who can deny this? But this is far different from the notion, that some minds have a natural congruity or suitableness to the Gospel. The fallow-ground of the heart may be broken up, ploughed and prepared by unseen and most circuitous means."—*Remains, p.* 217.

"Were a benighted inhabitant of Otaheite to feel the wretchedness of his present life, and to lift up his soul to the God he worshipped as a Supreme Being for happiness, no doubt God would hear such a prayer.—*Ib. p.* 110.

Art. XII & XIII. "* * * The Article contemplates these two states,—one of justifying grace, and one of utter destitution of grace; and it says, that those who are in utter destitution, can not do any thing to gain justification; and indeed, to assert the contrary would be Pelagianism." But "men are not always either in light or darkness, but are sometimes between the two; they are sometimes not in a state of Christian justification, yet not utterly deserted by God, but in a state something like that of Jews or of heathen, turning to the thought of religion. They are not gifted with *habitual* grace, but they are still visited by divine influences, or by actual grace, or rather *aid;* and those influences are the first-fruits of the grace of justification going before it, are intended to lead on to it, and to be perfected in it as twilight leads to day. * * * It is quite true that works done *with* Divine aid, and in faith, *before* justification, *do* dispose men to receive the grace of justification; such as were Cornelius's alms, fasting and prayers, which led to his baptism." But, "it is not the works themselves that make them meet, * * * but the secret aid of God, vouchsafed," &c.—*Tract, XC. Am. Ed. pp.* 15, 16.

Celibacy of the Clergy. "It seems to me, that many men do not give sufficient weight to our Lord's observation upon those *who make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake*, nor to St. Paul's reasoning on the subject of marriage. I would only imply, that both our Lord and the Apostle seem to establish it as a principle, that a single state when it can be chosen for the sake of the Gospel, is the superior state. This, I fear, is too much forgotten, and those men, who might have *received the saying*, and have done more service to the Church of God by receiving it, have given it little or no weight in their deliberations. * * * The cases, I allow, are extremely few, in which a man may do, on the whole, more service to the Church, by imitating St. Paul, than by marrying; yet there are such cases; and it behooves every minister seriously to consider himself and his situation, before he determines on marriage. He should not regard this state as indispensably necessary to him, but should always remember, that, cæteris paribus, he, who remains single, is most worthy of honor."—*Remains, pp.* 101, 102.

"But what has this, my lord, in common with Rome and Romanism? The preference of celibacy, as the higher state, is Scriptural, and as being such, is Primitive. The corruption of Rome was not its *preference*, but its tyrannical and ensnaring and avaricious *enforcement;* it was in forcing (in the middle ages) the clergy to separate from their wives, and against the law of God, 'putting those asunder whom God had joined;' and this for her own aggrandizement, to make the clergy more dependant on herself; * * * it is in enforcing ruthlessly a rigid rule of singleness upon all her clergy, and drawing them into it before they know their own strength or weakness; it is in preferring the risk of their salvation to the risk of her own power, and casting them ruthlessly into temptation, without regard to the weak, rather than abandon a rule which binds them all, though with an iron band, to herself. And thus that corrupt Church has, in the minds of the undistinguishing, cast a reproach over that which Scripture points out as the more excellent, and tainted it with her pride, and avarice, and lust of power." *Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford. Am. Ed. p.* 142.

Confession. "Professional men—a minister—* * * have an official secresy imposed upon them. If this were not the case, a distrest conscience could never unburden itself to its confessor. * * * This applies in a very high sense, to a minister, considered as a confessor,—a director of the conscience. An alarmed conscience will unfold its inmost recesses before him. * * * I thought myself right, in urging upon persons who have opened their hearts to me, deep humiliation before God for crimes committed in an unconverted state: but, as it had pleased Him to give a thorough hatred of those crimes to the mind, and a consequent self-loathing and humiliation, and yet to allow in His providence that they should have remained undiscovered, I judged that the matter might safely be left to Him. Yet there may be cases in which general consequences require that confidence should be betrayed. Such cases usually relate to *evil in progress.*"—*Remains, p.* 228. D.

"It is pleasant indeed to reflect, that this ancient practice, [private confession] has found its advocates among English Divines less ardent perhaps than Cecil or Martyn, but with a more awful estimate of the power, and a deeper sense of the privileges of the Catholic Church."—*British Critic, April*, 1843. *p.* 302.

"When the Reformers repudiated the law of clerical celibacy they showed a clear foresight of danger when they rejected also the compulsory rule of confession. * * * Is it every clergyman of our own communion, nay is it every grave and well-conducted and estimable clergyman, who is pained and shocked at the idea of a 'flirtation' at an oratorio in a Church, or, of the encouragement of 'indefinable sympathies' be-

tween the curate and his fair coadjutrix in the work of instruction, or charity, or even (worse still) the preacher and some female member of his congregation? * * * Let us not think then, of a return to unrestricted and indiscriminate confession, until, by some ecclesiastical provision or other, we are secure against such monstrous combinations of ideas as are involved in the notions of a 'gentlemanlike' priest, or a 'fascinating' penitent. * * * Secret confession will be found, as a general practice, impossible, except where the confessor is either celibate or married."—*Ib. pp.* 336. s.

—

Secularity in the Church. "The Church of England is not fitted in its present state, to be a general Church. Its secularity must be purged away. We shall hasten that day, when Christians shall be of one heart and one mind, if we cultivate the spirit of charity in our respective circles. I have aimed much at this point, and shall push it farther. The rest must be left to Providence. He only can, by unknown means, heal the schisms of the Church, and unite it together as one external body; and that this will be done, as some think, by persecution, appears highly probable. I see no other means adequate to the end."—*Remains, p.* 220.

" * * the writer of the article on Bishop Jewel [B. Critic, July, 1841] *admits* that he wishes for a *great change* in the English Church. * * '*By Protestantism,*' he repeats, '*I understand not so much a collection of doctrines constituting a protest against Rome, as a certain tone of mind.*' * * * by *un*protestantizing, he of course only means the infusion of *some other tone*, and some *other general disposition;* he does *not* mean an alteration of the Church *system*, and removal of established *institutions.* * * He *aims* at the improvement of the *character* of the Church, and *at that alone.*"—*B. Critic, July,* 1842. *pp.* 212, 213.

"One side professed strictness, but threw the Sacraments aside; the other maintained the Sacraments, but attended too little to strictness; it was necessary to *join strictness* and *the Sacraments together;* and this Dr. Pusey did in his solemn, powerful, and deep tract upon Baptism and Repentance," &c.—*Ib. p.* 233.

—

Query. Why,—as every one ought to be allowed to explain himself when he is misunderstood,—why, in the name of justice, not to say of honesty, did not "the Bishop of Ohio," in Appendix B. to his late Charge, containing many extracts from the article on Bishop Jewel, (B. Critic, July, 1841) make the slightest allusion to, or extract from the explanatory article of July, 1842? Doubtless, being "*fully* persuaded in his own mind," he was perfectly right in giving his impressions of "Oxford Theology," and guarding his clergy and laity against what he thought false doctrine; but, with all deference be it said, he had *no* right whatever to extract only *objectionable* passages and points without even alluding to others by which these were modified or explained. If it be said that, this would have required a large volume, then he should have written a volume, and *charged* those under him, in some other way and on some other topics.

But, we must not forget Mr. Cecil. I am far from saying that his sentiments are "Tractarian," (by anticipation,) nor that they are all such as a "Tractarian" would admit. His "Remains" afford proof to the contrary. But this can fairly be said, that any one *now* uttering such language as that quoted, would be a marked man, and esteemed a "Puseyite," unless saved from reproach by his reputation for Evangelism. The quotations, however, are made only as one confirmation of the position taken by Mr. Gladstone, showing that the "Oxford movement" is the filling-up or completion of a religious progress begun previously in England.

Two more extracts from the "Remains;" one, for the benefit of Gambier Theologians, and the other for the benefit of all to whom it may apply, and I lay Mr. C. on the shelf, till again called for. "Instead of attempting any logical and metaphysical explanation of *Justification* by the imputed righteousness of Christ, all which attempt have human infirmity stamped upon them, I would look at the subject in the great and impressive light in which Scripture places it before me. It teaches me to regard the intervention of Christ for me, as the sole ground of all expectation toward God. In consideration of his sufferings, my guilt is remitted, and I am restored, to that which I had lost by sin. Let us add to this, that the sufferings of Christ were in our stead, and we shall see the point of view in which Scripture sets him forth as the deserver and procurer to us of all pardon and grace. The thing is declared—not explained. Let us not therefore darken a subject which is held forth in a prominent light, by our idle endeavors to make it better understood."—*Remains, p.* 222.

Again. "There is a manifest want of spiritual influence on the ministry of the present day. I feel it in my own case, and I see it in that of others. I am afraid that there is too much of a low, managing, contriving, manœuvering temper of mind among us. We are laying ourselves out more than is expedient, to meet one man's taste, and another man's prejudices. The ministry is a grand and holy affair, and it should find in us a simple habit of spirit, and a holy but humble indifference to all consequences."—*Ib. p.* 116. G. H. T. E.

Dec. 1843.

For the Churchman.

Binghamton, Broome Co., January 13, 1844.

Rev. and Dear Brother,—As I have noticed in the acknowledgments of the Treasurer of the Foreign Committee of the D. and F. M. S. P. E. C. but a portion of the names of those who subscribed towards the maintainance of Mr. Southgate at Constantinople, it has occurred to me that in some cases it may not be recollected that the first year's payment should have been forwarded before the close of 1843. Allow me, through the Churchman, to remind these generous friends that farther delay may prove perilous to the station. The ground on which it was re-established was partly that I had secured subscriptions which would defray about one half the whole expense. The Committee is pressed for funds, and I am persuaded that this hint will be sufficient to bring to its relief the sums already pledged in behalf of Mr. Southgate and yet due for the year just closed. It was indeed anticipated that other names would have been furnished to the list ere this. And does not the violent, and wholly unjustifiable assault, the offspring of sectarian jealousy, both upon the bishops of our Church and its able and faithful representattve in Turkey, especially call at present for such testimonies of sympathy? Let fervent prayers accompany the benefactions offered for one, who counts not his life dear unto himself so that he may conscientiously fulfil the important commission with which he is entrusted; and who, in its fulfilment, simply occupies himself with his allotted work—and avoids all interference with the concerns of others. Let it also not be forgotten that he stands at his appointed post, a post of great difficulty and labor, alone, with none near to cheer, counsel, or help him. I add a list of the subscribers, and would consider it a favor if other Church journals would copy it, with the above communication.

The subscription is $25 annually, for five years, the first payable during 1843.

Your brother in Chsist,
J. J. Robertson.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Rt. Rev. Bishop of New Jersey.
Rt. Rev. Bishop of Maryland.
Rev. J. J. Robertson, Binghamton, N. Y.
Horace Binney, Jr., Esq., Philadelphia.
A. D. Bache, M. D., Philadelphia.
John S. Millar, Esq., Philadelphia.
F. W. Brune, Jr., Esq., Baltimore.
J. Mason Campbell, Esq., Baltimore.
Rev. Geo. F. Worthington, three subscriptions.
J. Kip Anderson, Esq., St. James's Hall, Md.
Rev. Thos. C. Pitkin, Louisville, Ky.
Do. for Sunday-school of Christ Ch., Louisville.
Goldsborough Robinson, Esq., Louisville.
Mrs. Goldsborough Robinson.
Dr. John E. Cooke, Louisville.
Rev. Ed. F. Berkley, Lexington, Ky.
Robert Hare Powel, Philadelphia.
John William Wallace, Philadelphia.
Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D., New Rochelle, N. Y.
Dr. Shattuck, Boston.
Benjamin Gerhard, Esq., Philadelphia.
Rev. Benjamin I. Haight, New York.
Rev. Lewis P. W. Balch, New York.
O. N. C., by Rev. P. W. Balch.
Anon., Newton Lower Falls, Mass., by Rev. J. J. Robertson.
Anon., Philadelphia, by Rev. Dr. Dorr.

The assaults (above referred to) of the sectarian press—especially the New York Observer and Evangelist—have been the means of making us much better acquainted than we were before with Mr. Southgate and his mission. We confess that we find the mission conducted on sounder principles, and in the spirit of a more enlarged charity than we expected. This, together with the shameful assaults on the mission, induces us to wish that its history and design should be more frequently presented to the attention of our readers, and that their sympathies should be more enlisted in its favor.

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1844.

DR. POTTS AND DR. WAINWRIGHT.

On our outside will be found another letter from Dr. Potts, with the reply of Dr. Wainwright. We read this letter of Dr. Wainwright with some sense of disappointment, for we had supposed that in it he would take leave of an antagonist who has shown himself unworthy of him. The conduct of Dr. Potts seems to us to have been evasive throughout. Dr. Wainwright did not throw himself open to every body that might make a public assault on him; and it was more from courtesy than obligation that he accepted Dr. Potts's challenge. Why then does not Dr. Potts attempt what he promised to perform? Dr. Potts had pledged himself to prove that Episcopacy was "unscriptural, schismatical, unsocial, anti-republican," &c., and if on second thoughts he found this proposition too big for him, he was at liberty to prove the affirmative of Dr. Wainwright's position, and to show that there could be a Church* without a bishop. Instead of this, he comes forward with what he calls definitions adapted to express his antagonist's sense of his terms, and that confessedly with a view to accomplish "indirectly" an end which he could not accomplish directly—in other words to circumvent his antagonist. Dr. Potts seems to have no just idea of what constitutes a definition in the logical sense of the term; what he calls *definitions* being no better than loose and declamatory descriptions; but if his definitions had been as sound as they are logically and theologically vicious and redundant, still his conduct in attempting to lure his opponent into a false position, was wholly unjustifiable. This, together with his studious avoidance of the main issue, was proof of his incapacity for a logical discussion, and would have justified Dr. Wainwright in leaving him. We do not mean to say that we think Dr. Wainwright should leave the subject, but only that he should leave an antagonist who is not like to be brought to a regular and systematic discussion.

P. S. Since writing the above, we have read the fifth letter of Dr. Potts, which will be found on our third page. Its tone is more subdued and civil than that of his former letters, and it gives some encouragement to hope that he will approach the subject. We trust that the way is now opening for Dr. Wainwright to disabuse his antagonist—if he is willing to be disabused—of his very erroneous and unjust conceptions of Church principles, and to press the evidence in their favor on such as are, through God's grace, capable of receiving it.

* We here use the word Church in the strict sense, to mean a Church *properly speaking*, or *a congregation of men united in the faith and sacraments of* Christ, *under lawful pastors*, or pastors whom Christ has appointed and with whom He has promised to be present. In a loose sense the term *Church* may be applied to any body of professing Christians. We habitually use the word in both senses, the context serving to determine its meaning.

RELATIONS OF THE LAITY.

The Catholic Herald reprints the greater part of our notice of Bishop Hughes's Lecture, but omits the questions, lest, by answering them he should encroach on the province of the Freeman's Journal of this city. The latter gives the questions also, but "not with a view of answering every point in detail, which is altogether unnecessary." We quite agree with him: the questions implied affirmative propositions, and were not expected to be answered—nor have they been.

The editor should know that a principle is involved in withholding the word *Catholic* and substituting *Romanist* in its stead. Certainly the use of the latter term was prompted by no disrespect to his bishop, and much less by the low motive which he imputes to us. The Journal cannot but know that Bishop Onderdonk is "Bishop of New York by the same authority as that by which his Grace of Canterbury inherits the title" and "the jurisdiction of his See:" and if another bishop in communion with Rome makes the same claim, some term of distinction is necessary. We know none better than *Roman* or *Romanist*.

Having quoted a large portion of our remarks the Journal says:—

"We quote the whole of these remarks, not with a view of answering every point in detail (which is altogether unnecessary) but rather to show what seems to us a struggle in the mind of the Editor between his admiration of the Catholic Church, and his distrust of that same Church, which may justly be ascribed to the influence of Protestant education. The inconveniences which he alludes to, are not felt in the Catholic communion, though they are essential to the indefinite forms of Protestantism. In the Church the authority of the Pastors is recognized by the faithful, as that of Christ to them delegated. They know very well that they would soon introduce the confusion which prevails among the sects, if the choice of the clergy were left to popular canvass, as are the officers of the civil government. As to the Scriptures, also, they know that the Church is in possession of the spirit which gives life, whilst the sects are in perpetual disputation about the letter, which, through their perversion of it, killeth. So in like manner, the Holy Apostolic See will always be the confirming power in the election of Bishops. To imagine a Catholic Church, or a part of the Catholic Church, not in communion with the Holy See, is a contradiction. Again; with respect to the clergy of the United States, they are with scarcely an exception, citizens, either by birth, or by adoption, as much as the Editor of the Churchman himself.

"The subsequent portion of the Churchman's remarks are certainly, to our minds, not a little surprising. If there is any thing which seems to make the Oxford writers sad, it is precisely the chains which the laity have cast around their Church. The Churchman must know very well that the laity, in the popular sense of the word, have no more to do with the election of the clergy in England than they have with the appointment of governors for the Colonies. He knows very well that without the permission of Government, even the clergy cannot assemble in their houses of convocation. He knows that in this country also, a large portion of the clergy, with whom he himself is supposed to sympathize, look upon the interference of the laity, in ecclesiastical matters, as an evil of no common magnitude. And yet it is another inconsistency, for which we cannot account, that in the remarks before us, he should seem the advocate of what he is so universally believed to deplore. He speaks of the "intelligent and harmonious co-operation of the laity with the clergy in spiritual things." On that point he may be assured that it is as complete, in the Catholic Church as can be desired. The result is the most perfect and "harmonious co-operation" between the clergy and the laity, and the spectacle exhibited in the late "Episcopal Convention," of laymen overruling their Pastors, will never be exhibited in the Catholic communion."

"To imagine a Catholic Church," says the Journal, "or a part of the Catholic Church, not in communion with the Holy See, is a contradiction." This is his πρωτον ψευδος; and as it rests only on his own assertion, it might be sufficient to meet it with a denial. We oppose to it, however, the following refutation. If there cannot be a Catholic Church, or a part of the Catholic Church, except in communion with the See of Rome, then the See of Rome should be infallible; since, if not infallible, it may give just grounds of separation. But by the confession of Roman theologians, the See of Rome is not infallible; and therefore there can be no contradiction, even on Romanist grounds, in saying that there may be a Catholic Church, or part of the Catholic Church, not in communion with the See of Rome.

If the Journal will disabuse his mind of this error, he will have no difficulty in seeing that when we speak of the *British, Gallican, German, Venetian, American, &c.*, Churches, we make no allusion to any dependence on, or connexion with the civil government of these countries. We hold the Church to be entirely independent of civil government, and civil government to be independent of the Church; and we refer to the geographical limits merely as terms of convenience to distinguish portions of that One Body, who are united in the faith and sacraments of Christ under Bishops of His appointment. This use of the terms is so common in his own communion, that we are surprised he should object to it. He has doubtless heard of the Declaration of the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church, and of the charges of schism, heresy, &c., which were brought against Bossuet and the Gallican bishops, by the *Spanish, Hungarian,* and *Ultramontane* bishops, for resisting the encroachments of the Roman See. Indeed, he himself allows the use of these geographical terms to designate certain members of the One Body, or branches of the One Tree; and this is all we mean by them. He indeed imagines that the head of this body, the trunk of this tree, must be at Rome, and that there can be no such thing as Catholic unity except in visible communion with the Roman See. But this is merely the effect of his Romish education. Sounder views would teach him that Catholic unity consists in the possession of the faith and sacraments of Christ administered by authority derived from the Apostles. His own writers would tell him that unity may subsist while communion with the Roman See is interrupted.

The Journal says that "with respect to the [Roman] clergy of the United States they are, with scarcely an exception, citizens either by birth or adoption." This we did not mean to question: we may admit it, and still contend that they are a body *in*, but not *of* the United States. They are appointed by a foreign power, and amenable to a foreign power; and the fact that they, or the chief among them, are now, or shall be hereafter, citizens of our country, is an accident, a favor, the tenure of which is dependent on the breath of a foreign power. A clergy so constituted, is a *Roman* and not an *American* Catholic body; and the fact that they are citizens, either by birth or adoption, does not in the least affect the bearing of our question, "Whether the American laity were admitted to unite with the clergy in the control of temporalities, and in legislating in those matters (and of course those only) on which particular Churches are competent to legislate?" If the clergy were an *American* body, whose appointments originated, and whose responsibilities (under God) terminated in our own country, such a query would be less significant.

The Oxford writers have reason to be sorrowful at the chains which are cast around the Church of England. They may well object to such lay representation as is found in the British Parliament, which has long since ceased to represent the laity of the English Church, and in which Romanists and Socinians are allowed to legislate with Churchmen on matters pertaining to the interests of the Church. But where do the Oxford divines condemn the principle of accepting the aid and co-operation of the laity in legislating in the Church on matters which are not of faith? We are not aware that they object to the principle; if they do, their objection does not apply to us; for we urged it in reference to this country, and as the true Catholic security against that concentration of authority in Rome, which in England has been arrested by the uncatholic and worldly scheme of the alliance of Church and State. Is there any sound Catholic principle against the admission of the laity to such legislation, and especially in reference to the temporalities of the Church? Or are the laity of the Catholic Church in this country unworthy of the confidence?

The Journal tells us that we know that in this country, a large portion of the clergy, with whom we are supposed to sympathize, look upon the interference of the laity in ecclesiastical matters as an evil of no common magnitude. Understanding him to refer to the participation of the laity in the legislation of our Church, conformably to its constitution and canons, we assure him we know no such thing. We are accustomed to hear those of our bishops and clergy of whose sentiments we have the most knowledge, refer to this feature of our Church with pride and gratitude, and entire confidence in its practical operation. It is not too strong language to say that in several critical emergencies, the counsels of our laity have been, humanly speaking, the salvation of our Church. As to the scene of our late Convention, to which the Journal covertly, and his Philadelphia *confrere* broadly alludes, we presume the editors are sufficiently versed in ecclesiastical history to know that there have been councils consisting exclusively of Catholic bishops in which ten times the excitement and confusion prevailed, or rather which presented scenes of tumult and uproar of a totally different *kind*. The excitement, therefore, was not the fault of the laity, nor of lay representation; and if episcopal councils, with all their intrigues and tumults, have, on the whole, been overruled for good, why may we not augur well of councils composed in part of laymen?

Besides, what sustained the Bishop of this diocese in the truly Apostolic stand which he took in vindication of his order? He was sustained by the intense and unanimous approbation of the assembled audience, consisting chiefly of the laity. Of this the editor of the Freeman's Journal is a witness. He was himself present at the closing scene of the Convention; he has himself eloquently described the burst of enthusiastic applause which followed on the bishop's rejection of "the protest," and he had himself at the time the manliness to deny the current report—and we thank him for having done so—that this applause was mingled with hisses. In the cordial approbation then expressed; in the generous confidence of the laity, to which he appealed; in the spontaneous dictates of their own hearts, our Catholic bishop found that free-will support which a Roman bishop would have sought from the coercive authority of the Pope; for it is Bishop Kenrick, as we remember, who tells us in one of his letters to Bishop Hopkins, that bishops need the authority of the pope, as a foil against the aggressions of the laity.

In no portion of the Catholic Church is the authority of the pastors recognized by the faithful as that of Christ, to them delegated, more fully than in our own; and the Journal is ignorant of our system if he supposes the choice of the clergy to be left among us to popular canvass, as are the officers of civil government. We utterly eschew the doctrine that pastors are created by the choice, or by any act of the people. They are ordained by episcopal authority alone; and the popular election of which we spoke is limited to a choice from among those who have been ordained by the bishops. Their ordination is a sufficient guarantee of their meetness for the office; the people, therefore, cannot go much amiss in their choice; and it surely argues a strange want of confidence in them to deny them the privilege of a choice from among a number of pastors who differ in nothing essential but are all bound to think, to teach and to act *salva fide et ecclesia.*

The Journal, it seems, allows that the Holy Scriptures are not the Christian's birthright, but that they are to be read merely under favor from the bishops. We reject, as well as himself, the unlimited exercise of private judgment, and acknowledge that the Scriptures are to be read under the guidance of the Church, and not to be interpreted by her members in contravention to her articles of faith: but it strikes us as an anomaly that the members of any society should not be allowed, of right, access to the records of its institution and its principles, and as a very strange term of Catholic Communion, to insist that baptism which regenerates and makes us the sons of God and heirs of heaven, does not also confer a son's and heir's right of seeing and possessing the testaments of the Father's will. For his application of the text, "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," the editor is indebted to Luther; his own writers have sufficiently refuted it, and shown conclusively that the *letter* means the law of Moses, and *spirit* the gospel of Christ.

To us it seems that the whole drift of the editor's remarks is to turn the attention of his readers from the points which we presented, and to amuse them with flattering speeches. We do not complain of this, for he was under no obligation to notice our remarks at all; and we confess we are at a loss to see why he did so. But since he has done so, we have only to repeat that he has said nothing to affect the conclusion which we drew in regard to Bishop Hughes's lecture. The conclusion was that while the friends of liberty are bound with Bishop Hughes to acknowledge their obligations to the Catholic Church, for its labors in the extension of liberty, civil and ecclesiastical, they are under the least possible obligations to the Roman See; since the Roman See by concentrating within itself the power, responsibility, wealth, influence and patronage of the Catholic Church in this and every other country which accepts its communion, seeks to confine and repress the principles of liberty which have been nurtured in the Catholic Church. We should not at first have made the remark, only that Bishop Hughes appeared to be so smitten with the love of liberty, and its congeniality with the expanding energies of this Western Hemisphere that it seemed to us to be matter of surprise that he did not advocate its enlargement in the shape of lay-election, lay-representation, and lay-participation in the management of Church temporalities. We believe that only one reason could be given to show that such measures would not be Catholic, and that is, that they are not Roman.

WHO IS AT FAULT?

The Bishop of Michigan, in his correspondence with the Committee for Domestic Missions, uses the following language:

"I think the greatest obstacle in the way of success in the West, is the continual cry coming from the East, and from some other parts: 'The Church is in danger,'—'Heresies are creeping in.' People are unwilling to connect themselves with a Church that is always in danger, and you may rest assured that if this course is pursued a little longer, it will put us back many years in our efforts to bring men into the true fold of the Saviour."

With all due respect, we beg leave to ask who create those "obstacles" of which the Bishop complains,—they who *cause* the "danger," or they who give warning? they who *bring in* "heresies," or they who *expose* and *resist* them? Who shall cease from pursuing their "course," such as "transgress the laws," "change the ordinance," and (overlaying the great doctrine of justification by faith) "break the everlasting covenant?" or they who "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints," and "hold fast the form of sound words?"—*Christian Witness.*

The question, in our judgment, is sufficiently answered by the very terms in which it is couched. They who are "in fault," they who create the "obstacles," are men who bring against their brethren "railing accusations" which they never seek to define and substantiate. Thus the propounder of the above interrogatories, prefers against some persons whom he does not name, the charges of bringing in heresies, of transgressing the laws, of changing the ordinances, and of breaking the everlasting covenant by overlaying the great doctrine of justification by faith! To the editor of the Witness all this may be sport, but for our own part, we would as soon have our conscience burthened with the guilt of murder as with any one of the crimes which his rash and trifling pen has thus indiscriminately charged on his brethren. And yet these reckless, awful, indefinite, unsubstantiated charges are so common, so in harmony with the spirit of the press, (we do not mean merely the periodical press,) that they are probably read by ninety-nine in a hundred without horror, and would excite no surprise even if they occurred in an Episcopal Charge.

One proximate cause of this stupefaction of the moral sense we take to be a denial of the distinction between mortal and venial sins, and a consequent persuasion that all sins are of equal malignity. Hence, every wrong opinion in religion is accounted a heresy, and every wrong action a breaking of the everlasting covenant! Another is the practical denial of the objective reality of truth and falsehood, right and wrong. Men think and speak and write as if they had no other standard whereby to test the morality and evangelical rectitude of opinions and actions than the existing state of their own minds. They seem practically to forget that the Church propounds to them her creed for a rule of faith, and the ten commandments for a rule of charity; and account things to be heretical and wicked for no better reason than they do not square with the fleeting impressions of their own consciousness.

BISHOP HOPKINS'S LETTERS OF "THE NOVELTIES."

Bishop Hopkins has addressed a series of letters to the Bishops, clergy, and laity of our Church, the subjects of which are thus described in the words of the author:

"The first subject which I shall present is that of Lay Baptism, inasmuch as the novel practice of re-baptizing those who have received baptism at the hands of our non-Episcopal brethren, is openly defended, and is on the increase. My motives for placing this matter at the commencement, have arisen out of my official sphere of duty. The public allowance of re-baptization in the case of some students of the General Seminary in A. D. 1841, has given me trouble in my own diocese. Bound, as I conceive, by the strongest ecclesiastical arguments, to deny the lawfulness of such re-baptization, I have promised to publish my reasons; and I address them to you with the desire, that when the next General Convention meets together, under the favor of divine Providence, this may be one of the points on which I may have the counsel of my colleagues.

"Another novelty which I regret to see, is the systematic refusal of the term Church to the various orthodox communions of our non-Episcopal brethren, on the alleged ground, that since Episcopacy is manifestly of divine institution, there can be no Church where there are no bishops.

"A third novelty to which I cannot assent, is the view of the Real Presence in the holy Eucharist, as set forth in the Oxford Tracts, and presented in the late sermon of the Rev. Dr. Pusey. In connexion with this, stands the general scope of what is called *the sacramental theology*, and the theory of priestly power.

"A fourth novelty, which has produced a more serious fermentation than all the rest, in consequence of the recent ordination of Mr. Carey, is the theological notion that the tenets of the Council of Trent may be reconciled to sound Catholic (or orthodox and primitive) doctrine. And along with this, I am compelled to classify the apparent favor exhibited towards the extraordinary assault of a Transatlantic periodical, the British Critic, upon the cardinal doctrine of *Justification by Faith*, and the *Protestant character* of the Church of England.

"I have called these things '*Novelties*,' not because the notions themselves were never heard before, but because they have never been presented, until lately, in such a form and under such peculiar circumstances, as to *disturb our peace* by their *practical influence*. That in this respect they are the fruits of the Tractarian theory, is doubted by no one. And while I entertain none but the kindliest feelings of personal regard and affection towards the distinguished advocates of that theory, whether in our mother Church, or in our own, I have already, (in my Charge of 1842,) been obliged to dissent from their system; and now propose to act on the same principle, under the vast increase of responsibility, which has arisen from the unexpected developments of the past year."

We are sorry to see from another passage that the bishop seeks to be witty at the expense of the editors of the periodical press of our Church—whom he exalts to the mock dignity of patriarchs. For one, acknowledging our faults, we had rather be approached by those in authority in the language of sober and dignified expostulation, though we confess that satire and ridicule are better than spiteful and angry denunciations. Bishop Hopkins will find, if we mistake not, that the editorial corps have too much respect for the Episcopal office to indulge in the retort which his witticism invites.*

We shall take the liberty to make a few remarks on the first of the above (so called) "Novelties."

We say nothing of Lay Baptism within the Church and as practised under her sanction, but confine our remarks to Lay Baptism without the Church and in contravention to her authority. The opinion that such baptism is null and void has been held among us from the beginning of our ecclesiastical existence. The first bishop of our Church held the opinion and consistently reduced it to practice. The present bishop of this diocese has pursued the same course from the commencement of his ministry. Bishop Hobart† adopted the same view. Bishops Moore of New York, and Moore of Virginia the same. Others might be named; but these are enough to show that the opinion and practice are no "novelty" in our Church. In the Church of England the same view is advocated by Waterland, who, we suppose, stands as high in the estimation of the House of Bishops as Burnet. The Church of Rome maintaining a different theory has been brought practically to a like result; the alleged carelessness of Protestants in regard to the form and administration of the sacrament making it unsafe to depend on the validity of their acts; so that the rebaptization (as it is called) of converts is common among Romanists both in Great Britain and this country.

Bishop Hopkins thinks that the opinion or the increasing favor with which it is regarded is one of "the fruits of the Tractarian theory." We do not know what is meant by "the Tractarian theory," but we believe that we may assert without fear of contradiction that the authors of the Tracts for the Times have never denied the validity of Lay Baptism. Indeed few things would surprise us more than such a denial from such a source.

The opinion therefore is neither new nor Tractarian; but the bishop adds, that "it has never been presented until lately in such a form and under such peculiar circumstances as to disturb our peace by its practical influence." If "our peace is disturbed," there are two ways of accounting for it: our solution is this; that men have become of late so frightened at certain phantoms to which they give the names of "Puseyism," and "Tractarian theory," that they disturb themselves and disturb others about matters which ten years ago would have given them no concern.

In the last English Convocation (in the beginning of the last century) the House of Bishops with a view to an accommodation with Dissenters, endeavored to procure an authoritative recognition of the validity of Lay Baptism. The measure was defeated by the Lower House who rested their refusal to co-operate with the bishops mainly on the following grounds:

"1. Because the validity of such Baptism is a point which the Catholic Church and the Church of England in particular hath hitherto avoided to determine by any synodical declaration.

"2. Because the inconveniences manifestly attending such determination would, in their humble opinion, far outweigh the conveniences proposed by it, especially at a time when the authority of the Christian Priesthood is so openly struck at by some: and the advantage of an Episcopal mission, derived by an undoubted succession from the Apostles, is so undervalued by others."

We have no fear that a majority of our bishops would ever be found to advocate a similar measure; but if they should, we have such confidence in the practical wisdom of our Clerical and Lay deputies as to believe that they would never suffer the General Convention to commit itself to an opinion, one way or the other, on one of the most difficult practical questions of theology. We have no wish to underrate the grievances of which Bishop Hopkins complains; but can they be removed without creating others which are tenfold worse?

We feel less interest in this question of Lay Baptism than on some others which Bishop Hopkins proposes to discuss, and should have passed it by in silence had he not cast reproach on those whom we hold in respect. If he can succeed in convincing those who come to us from non-Episcopal Churches of the validity of their baptism, we shall be glad. The remaining "Novelties" are yet to be discussed. As to the last of them, we ask only for accurate thinking and accurate writing. The statement that the ground has been taken that "the tenets of the Council of Trent may be reconciled to sound Catholic (or Orthodox and Primitive doctrine") is in one sense true and in another sense not true.

* The following is the passage to which we refer. The paper is not named in the pamphlet of Bishop Hopkins, and though we do not suppose that reference is made to the Churchman, (which was very guarded in relation to the official act of the Bishop of the Diocese of Ohio, and confined its remarks chiefly to the proceedings of the Convention of that Diocese,) yet we by no means admit that it is not the right, and may not be the duty, of a presbyter, deacon, or layman, publicly to express his disapprobation of the official acts of a bishop, and that too under a sense of responsibility not to Public Opinion, but to the constituted authorities of the Church. If this liberty is to be abridged, let it be done by a law of the Church, and not by vague claims of Episcopal power. In the case referred to by Bishop Hopkins, it may be that the Bishop transcended, while the presbyter acted within, the limits respectively prescribed to them by the Constitution and Canons of the Church. Of course, however, while we justify presbyters and laymen in the use of their lawful liberty, we admit that it is often praiseworthy to abstain from the use of it, and that only in *extreme cases* can they be justified *inforo conscientiæ*, in availing themselves of all the liberty which the laws of the Church concede.

"I confess that I could not help smiling at the new proof which this editorial objurgation has afforded, of the *majesty of the Periodical Press*. A presbyter sharply denounces two bishops, because they have presumed to dissent publicly, from the official course of one of their own order; without appearing at all conscious that *he* was transcending his limits as a presbyter, far more widely, by publishing *his* censure upon *them*.

"It may, indeed, be said, that he was acting IN HIS EDITORIAL CAPACITY; and doubtless, in the general mind of our community, this would be deemed a perfect justification. The simple, but irresistible inference is this: that the modern dignity of editorial government, must have something of the ancient *Patriarchate* about it, which is quite superior to the bishops of the Church; teaching with a more efficient influence, censuring with a more commanding authority, and yet, so far, as I have yet seen, *beyond even the Patriarchs* in this; that it is wholly irresponsible to any earthly tribunal, unless it be the vague and undefinable phantom called Public Opinion. May the Lord give a triple portion of his wisdom to those who wield the dangerous energies of such a power, for they need it all!" P. 70.

† In no part of his ministerial life was Bishop Hobart satisfied of the validity of Lay Baptism. Before he became bishop he baptized those who had been baptized by non-Episcopal ministers. After he became bishop he declined to do so from motives of policy and lest, the Church having never authoritatively spoken on the subject, he might seem to condemn such of his brethren in the Episcopate as took a different view of the subject from himself. At the same time, however, he not only allowed the practice in his parish and diocese, but approved of it and even expressed the wish to a clergyman who had been baptized in the Presbyterian Church, that he would apply for the sacrament to another clergyman of his diocese, whom he named. On his return from Europe, his attention having been directed to Waterland's Letters on the subject, he expressed himself more strongly than ever of the great hazard of resting on the baptism of Dissenters, and died with a deep conviction of its futility and danger.

From these facts, and from the known principles and practice of Bishop Seabury, of Bishop Moore of New York, (who administered the sacrament of baptism *more than fifty years ago* [so much for "novelty"] to a clergyman now living, and who had before received non-Episcopal baptism,) and Bishop Moore of Virginia, it is evident that the assertion of Bishop Hopkins that in treating such baptism as null and void, "we condemn the whole teaching * * of our first race of bishops, but just passed away," and pursue a practice "which amongst ourselves has only begun to find Episcopal patronage since the last General Convention," must be received with large abatements.

DIOCESAN MISSIONS.

At a meeting of our Diocesan Missionary Committee, on Tuesday evening, the Bishop read a letter addressed to him jointly by the Missionary at Ticonderoga, Essex County, and by a devoted and excellent layman in the same county. At the suggestion of the Committee, the Bishop sends for publication the following extracts:—

From the Missionary's Letter.—"The object of my addressing you, Rt. Rev. Father, is, to ask if you will send a clergyman to Keeseville, Essex, and parts adjacent. Congregations might be gathered at either of the villages; and furthermore, the communicants at both places (from 16 to 20 in number) absolutely require the nursing care and instruction of the Church." "If a clergyman could be appointed to take the oversight of them under you, he could soon, under God, permanently establish the Church."

From the Letter of Hon. Judge B.—"I beg leave humbly to submit to you my strong convictions that now is the time for the Church to better make her principles and authority known in Essex County. The field is evidently too large for one missionary, containing 15 towns, and near 1500 square miles; and yet there is not, I believe, a town in the County but has either members of the Church, or those who prefer it. There are many English and Irish families scattered through the County, especially in the back settlements, and about the iron works, which belonged to the Church in their own country; but being now scattered abroad, and isolated from each other, are in great danger of being lost. The same remark will in some measure hold true in reference to some families from the Eastern States. Right Reverend Father, cannot the Church extend her arms, and collect and gather in these wandering sheep? Can she longer close her ears to the cries of these lambs of Christ, ready to perish for lack of pasture on our bleak mountains? Well am I aware that your heart beats nothing but sympathy for their sad state. Can there nothing be done? Cannot some two or three families be induced to contribute sufficient to support a missionary at large in this County for a short term of time, say one, two, or three years? O how heart-cheering would it be to see all the children of these long neglected families receive the initiatory sacramental rite of grace, and all of the adults (being duly prepared) come forward, all in one place, to receive the holy rite of Confirmation at your hands, on your next visitation!"

"We humbly ask your prayers and your blessing."

A most faithful and exemplary clergyman, being also a tried and successful missionary, well known and much respected in Essex County, is ready and willing to enter upon this service; but the Committee found that the treasury is still deficient in the amount necessary to make to missionaries the payments due on the first of last October, and of course, *with not a cent for what was due on the first of this month.*

Under these circumstances, as has already been announced to the diocese, the Committee has been compelled to resolve not to appoint any new missionaries until the treasury is supplied with the means of paying the stipends that are actually due.

Harpers' Pictorial Bible.—If we have omitted to notice this work, it has not been for want of admiration of the design and execution evinced in the specimen number which is now before us. The embellishments seem to us to be illustrative of the sacred text, and highly creditable to the artists. We are particularly pleased to see that the publishers retain the marginal readings and propose to include the Apocrapha. We commend the work to the patronage of our readers.

Moehler's Symbolism.—We have been intending for a fortnight past to prepare a short notice of this work suited to its importance. We hope to do so in time for our next. Meantime it is right to acknowledge the receipt of a copy from the publisher, (Dunigan, 151 Fulton street,) whom we very cordially thank for having brought it out in an American edition.

Bishop Hobart's Apology. On our first page will be found an extract from this work, (lately reprinted by Stanford & Swords,) which very fairly meets and repels the charge of arrogance, intolerance, and want of charity, so often brought against Churchmen, for consistent adherence to their principles.

The Rev. George W. Fash, having removed from this Diocese to that of Connecticut with a letter of dismission, and been there received, has changed accordingly his canonical residence.

The Rev. Edward Selkirk, of New York, has received and accepted a unanimous call to Trinity Church, Albany, and requests all communications for him, addressed to No. 70 Herkimer street.

☞ Notices of several pamphlets which have been lately received are prepared, but unavoidably excluded this week. Also advertisements.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"L. L." will appear soon, perhaps in our next.

The correspondence in reference to the resignation of the Rev. Mr. Goodwin is unavoidably deferred; as also "A. A.'s" very handsome solution of the enigma of "L. M. D." Also, "A Presbyter of New York."

MARRIED.

On the 11th inst., by Rev. J. W. Diller, in St. John's Church, Islip, L. I., the Rev. D. V. M. Johnson, Rector of the Parish, to Miss Caroline Gertrude, daughter of the late Thomas Greenly, M. D.

From the Commercial Advertiser.

THERE CAN BE NO CHURCH WITHOUT A PRELATE.

FIFTH LETTER TO DR. WAINWRIGHT.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—The intervention of the duties of the Sabbath has delayed a reply to your last communication. I proceed now to pay my respects to it.

"To the hard words you have felt at liberty to use, I reply, nothing; to your reasoning, this :"

I. I am in possession of abundant evidence, given to me personally by members and ministers of various denominations of Christians, including a number of your own, that it is very generally desired by this community that the nature and grounds of the monopolizing claims of High Church partizans should be examined, and, if unjust, exposed. However, therefore, I might feel myself justified in refusing any reply to your last communication, because of its angry and lordly tone, I am quite resolved that none of these things shall ruffle my temper, or deter me from what I conceive to be an important duty. I intend to go forward with my object, although it is very evident that in doing so I am acting in opposition to the wishes of yourself and your friends.

II. I cannot agree with you that there is necessarily any thing "unworthy" of the Christian or ministerial calling in making a respectable public journal the medium of communication with the public mind, upon a topic which was thought of sufficient importance to be introduced to the public attention first at a dinner table, and then, by report, through the daily prints. Is it too sacred for the one, then I appeal to you whether it was not too sacred for the other? This should have been considered beforehand, and the consequences—apparently so disagreeable to you—should not be laid at the door of him who feels bound to call in question a public and most offensive attack, as publicly as it was made. Whether it was or was not an attack, and even a defiance, against unoffending Christian denominations, whose several Church relations are very dear to them, must now be left to the decision of the reader. To threaten me contingently with a charge of *slander*, for re-affirming what is so perfectly clear even to members of your own Church, who have sought me out to speak of this matter, will not alter the truth or frighten me from calling things by their right names. I regret, with you, that this or any similar discussion has originated, just as I regret that a necessity should ever arise for the resistance of false and injurious principles, or oppressive exactions of any kind. I regret that there is injustice in the world, and that there are insidious or violent assaults against God's truth; but since such things do exist, I do not regret that individuals can be found to whom the purity and integrity of truth are so much more valuable than a peace bought at the cost of a dastardly submission to error that they are willing to risk "the ribald remarks of licentious tongues add pens," and even worse evils. Such results are to be expected when a contest for great principles takes place, and I do not deny that they are to be ranked among those injurious things referred to by the Saviour under the name of "offences," which He says must needs occur, but of which—be it observed—He throws the whole responsibility upon those who wilfully occasion them.

III. Without retorting any of the discourteous language with which it would seem you desired to anger me, I shall now take the liberty of stating the reasons why your refusal to define your position, by defining in your own language the terms you have used, is to be considered as a virtual shrinking from the contest for which you have so often professed your readiness and confidence. In the first place, you are violating the admitted rule of dialectics which requires beforehand unambiguous definitions of all the prominent terms that are to be employed in a discussion. The justice of this rule is obvious to any one; for without such explicit definitions, it will be easy for an opponent, when pressed by an argument founded upon the supposed sense of his own terms, to escape by affirming that he did not use them in that sense. But in the next place, we are discussing this point in the *presence of the public*, and it is not to be taken for granted that the public are as well acquainted as ourselves, with the sense in which these terms are used by either of us. They can appreciate the force of arguments on either side only by first knowing the precise question of debate. And finally, I am anxious that you should set forth your meaning in your own words, because I desire the public to judge, from definitions of your own, that this is no small matter, about which it is idle to dispute. Neither of us thinks so. It is a question which, in your view, involves matters of life and death, and which, in my view, affects Christian liberty as opposed to a spiritual despotism, Catholic charity as opposed to schismatic bigotry, the spirituality of religion as opposed to a religion of sacraments, the efficacy of faith in the Redeemer as opposed to the efficacy of rites and ceremonies, and salvation received at the hands of Christ, as opposed to a salvation deposited in the hands, and only dispensed through the intervention, of man, be that man presbyter, prelate or Pope. These are some of the points involved, and therefore the justice of the demand which, upon the part of the public, I reiterate, for a definition of your terms. You say you will define them when you come to use them; but you *have* used them, and the proposition in which you have used them is the very subject of debate. All I desire is to have the public put in possession of the High Church sense of them, from a source which none will suspect, as possibly unfair. Until therefore you give them yourself, or admit those I have given, you enjoy the advantage of Indian warfare, that of fighting from an ambush. Is this, however, an honorable position for one who should have nothing to conceal, and who has said that truth, not victory, is his object?

IV. I must now beg the reader's attention to a passage in your last communication which cannot satisfy the least observant, although it denies as slanderous the charges which I have brought against your speech at the New England festival, of ecclesiastical proscription, unchurching your fellow Christians, defying them to prove that there can be a Church without a prelate, and monopolizing the rights and privileges of the Church of Christ." Were this denial accompanied by any expression of regret that you had incautiously used the language ascribed to you, and did not mean it to be understood in the sense naturally attached to the terms, I would at once relinquish my part in this controversy. But this you have not done. That language, in your own report of it, plainly conveys an assertion that the denominations of Christians in this and other lands who are not blessed with Bishops in your sense of the word, do not belong to the Church of Christ. Can language be plainer? And how do you avert the odium which must attach itself to such a position? By ascribing to *them* the guilt and shame of "unchurching" themselves. *You* have not unchurched them, forsooth; they have unchurched *themselves*. But who says this? Not themselves, but Dr. Wainwright and his coadjutors. This is a sophism too obvious to produce much effect in releasing you from the stigma against which you so vehemently protest, and which involves in it all the proscription, monopoly and exclusiveness which I have—fearless of the risk of uttering *a slander*—charged against your "principle." When analyzed, it is identical in meaning with a similar instance of bigotry, which I find in an Oxford Tractist. "How," he asks, "can we be justly charged with unchurching those who were never churched?" Instead of making good your denial, or justifying your threat of holding me responsible for *slander*, the passage in your letter now referred to only repeats the offence, with aggravations. "Be quiet, take the matter coolly," says an arrogant gentleman who publicly smites another in the fece—"you have no right to resist, for you are a worthless fellow, and for that reason I would have you know that *I* did not strike you—you struck *yourself*." This would hardly prove a satisfactory mode of adjusting an insult.

I happen to be acquainted with the "unanswered and unswerable" arguments and statements of Dr. Hobart and Dr. Bowden, and therefore decline any benefit from the plea of "ignorance," which you politely suggest. Still, not having "implicitly followed Dr. Mason and Dr. Miller," greatly as I admire them both, I will, of course, be the more open to the prospective illumination so kindly promised me.

This, I believe, is all that I need to say, in justification of the course I have taken, and the views I have thus far advanced, and from the farther prosecution of which I am not to be deterred by abusive epithets, or charges of unworthy motives, no matter from what source they come. Those who know me know that nothing but a sense of duty can have prompted me to depart so far from my ordinary habits as a man of peace. Forbearance has a limit.

And now I shall proceed to state the question, as clearly as I can, hoping that the reader may, ere long, come at a more distinct understanding as to your views of the point at issue. Many persons will not believe that your words mean all that they appear to affirm. Let them have an opportunity of judging, from your own pen. The language of your proposition is well known by this time—but I will repeat it:—"There can be no Church without a Prelate."

I refer the reader to my last letter for the true sense of the words "Church" and "Bishop" when used by High Church prelatists. I will not, therefore, repeat them here. Thus understood, I proceed to redeem my pledge, and to show that in its *nature* and *consequences* this position, though so confidently assumed, is *unscriptural*.

I wish that two considerations may be kept in view throughout my remarks, for they are necessary for a right understanding of my position. (I.) That I am not, in this discussion, the advocate of the ecclesiastical polity of that part of the Christian Church to which I consider it an honor to belong, except so far as that polity involves the ministerial rights of presbyters, or parochial (i. e. parish or congregational) Bishops. In affirming their right, I affirm the rights of presbyters of all anti-prelatical Churches. (II.) I am not assailing the views of those of our fellow-Christians who believe that prelacy is scriptural and expedient, but who do *not* believe that it is so enjoined in scripture as to be a *sine qua non* in the constitution of the Church of Christ; and who accordingly admit that the order of a Presbyterian ministry is valid, though not the best order. With such I am not contending; we agree to differ; we concede to them what they concede to us, a legitimate standing in the Catholic Church. The dogma which I have undertaken to resist and expose, is that which makes prelacy *essential* to the very being of the Church, so that without prelates there is *no* Church, and of course, no valid ministry and ordinances, no promises of God, no lawful reliance upon God's grace, no covenanted mercies, and no just and certain hope of reaching heaven. This is the dogma which you have received from Papist hands, and which I hold to be at war with the spirit and letter of the Word of God.

I. Because there is no warrant from the Word of God for making *any* particular external form of polity a condition of that Christian fellowship and communion with God, which are the distinguishing duties and privileges of the Church of Christ.

If there be such a warrant, produce it. The burden of proof rests on you. Let any one examine the tenor of the preaching of Christ and his Apostles, and then point to a solitary evidence that they placed, as you do, merely external relations upon a level with the exercise of the spiritual graces, of repentance toward God, and faith in Christ—or that they made the exercise of these spiritual affections dependant upon the individual's outward relations to a form of Church polity. On the contrary, this is the very error for which they condemn most earnestly the High Church pretensions of the Jews of their day, who insisted upon their ecclesiastical relationship to Abraham, their possession of a ritual, their circumcision, their doctrine of uninterrupted succession; and who were so tenacious of these externals, that they were for bringing some of them into the Christian Church with them. (See the Epistle to the Galatian Church.) Understand me, I hold the Church of Christ to be a society, a community of believers; and agree that it is right to conform to the general principles which are to be found in scripture for the regulation of that community, and the attainment of the end of all association, the benefit of those associated. I admit that I find what I conceive to be satisfactory evidence of a *best* form for the outward and visible Church; best, because best adapted for the developement of the grand principles of individual and social piety and brotherhood. I find order enjoined, and submission to order; the preaching of the Gospel, and obedience to the Gospel when preached. But I do not find any authority given for the doctrine you teach, that one particular order is absolutely essential to *the being* of a Church. I do not find that the preaching of the Gospel must depend for its efficacy upon the circumstance that it comes to the public ear through the lips of a ministry constituted after a particular fashion. The blessing of God is promised to the truth, and to men only as they preach the truth. The true apostolical succession is a succession of apostolic truth—and as compared with such succession, a line of Prelates reaching back to the days of the Apostles, though not a link in the chain were wanting, is as "the chaff to the wheat."

Take another view of the subject. Profound learning, combined with unquestionable piety, has been long employed in investigating the question as to the precise and detailed forms which the earliest Christian communities assumed, under the eye of the Apostles. And what has been the result of their inquiries? An acknowledged diversity of opinion. Men *who have fully agreed in regard to the great moral truths of the Gospel*, (and let any one take the written creeds of the various Christian bodies in the Protestant Church, and he will be struck with this doctrinal unanimity,) havecome to different conclusions as to various points affecting the polity or external organization of Christian communities.

Now, do we not find in this acknowledged diversity of sentiment upon the question of *formal* religion, among those who are admitted to agree upon the question of *real* religion, proof that scripture lays a very different stress upon them, and the most powerful argument for mutual forbearance and toleration? And is it not incompatible with common sense—I say nothing now of charity—for any one denomination, with these facts before them, to insist upon disowning fellow Christians, who agree with them in every other particular of faith and obedience to the spiritual laws of Christ, upon the single ground that they have not conformed to their *views of government and order?* Is the unity of the Christian body a unity in respect to form? or not rather a unity in faith and love for the same grand moving truths of the Gospel? Do none belong to the body of Christ, his church, but such as agree with us in every thing? And if differences are allowable, as you must admit, shall we restrict our communion to those who do not hold our views of *Church order*, although they may hold every thing else? In one word, is it not a sin against the spirituality of Christianity, that we should elevate conformity to what we deem true views of Church order, to a level with the "weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith?"

I cannot but think so. And strong as are my preferences for a particular form of government, I dare not deny, as you have done, that the man who is "a Christian," is by that very fact a member of Christ's church. You are bound to these alternatives: either to admit the covenant relations of other Christian churches, or by denying them, to admit that God has poured out his blessings, and raised up hosts of eminent, learned, devoted and useful Christians, among Christian bodies which were never in covenant with Him. If, as you will not deny, he has actually done the latter, then the inference is, either that yours is not the *only* church, or that, if it be, it is not the only or the principal channel of spiritual good to the world. In other words, Heaven has made no such discrimination between you and others as will justify your exclusive claims.

This is a common sense argument, and it confirms the position taken in the outset of these remarks, namely, that the formalities of religion ought not to be raised to the level of the spiritualities of religion; because all *fact* establishes the infinite superiority with which scripture invests the latter. The inference we draw is, that there is no warrant from scripture for making *any* particular external form of polity, a condition of that Christian fellowship and communion with God, which are distinguishing duties and privileges of the church of Christ.

Asking pardon for the length of this communication, I reserve other scriptural considerations for another occasion, and remain,

Respectfully, yours,
GEO. POTTS.

REV. DR. WAINWRIGHT TO REV. DR. POTTS.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—The first half of your letter is taken up with matters to which I shall reply very briefly.

In the first place, you still discuss the question as to who is the assailing party in this controversy, and reiterate your conviction that it is I who am the aggressor. My dear sir, let us drop this discussion. I can by no means admit the justice of your charge. Let the public decide between us on this point—I am quite willing to submit it to their decision.

In the second place, you speak of the "angry and lordly tone," of my last letter—its "discourteous language," designed "to anger" you—and of the "abusive epithets" and charges of "unworthy motives." I am totally unable to perceive that I have given you any just ground to speak on this wise. I cannot for one moment admit that I am justly chargeable under either of these heads. I have only to say again, let the candid public judge between us.

All the other points in your preliminary observations, that have any bearing upon the simple question in dispute, shall be disposed of in their proper places.

We have now got fairly to "the dogma," which you say I "have received from Papist hands," and which you hold to be "at war with the spirit and letter of the Word of God." I have received it from Papist hands precisely in the way in which you have received the Holy Scriptures, and the doctrine of the Trinity and the Atonement, &c. You surely will not esteem it a just ground of objection to any doctrine that it has been held by the Church of Rome in common with the great body of the Church catholic, at all times and in all places. And as regards this dogma, remember that its truth was never disputed, and conformity with its distinctive provision never departed from until after the Reformation; that it formed no ground of objection in the minds of the first reformers, to the Church of Rome, and that these great men yielded it up with marked reluctance, and only from the compulsion of the circumstances in which they were placed. But the question now properly before us is, where does this dogma, as you term it, find its *origin*, not through what channel it has come down to us. If it is "at war with the spirit and letter of the Word of God," as you say, I acknowledge that no power of prescription, no universality of acceptance could sustain it for one moment. Here I join issue with you, and say that the principle, there "can be no Church without a Bishop," is not anti-scriptural, but is in perfect consistency "with the spirit and letter of the Word of God." You ask me again for my definition of the terms "Church" and "Bishop." I reply that I use them precisely in the sense in which they are used in the standards of the Church of which I am a member. These are contained, as you know, in the Book of Common Prayer—to these definitions it is my intention rigidly to adhere, and if you detect in my remarks any departure from this resolution and will expose it, I shall thank you cheerfully, and amend the error. I presume you are equally ready to be bound by your own standards, and I will ask you for no other definitions than those which are there recorded, or which may be logically inferred from their plain propositions. You maintain your affirmation, 1st, on this ground—"because there is no warrant from the Word of God for making any particular external form of polity a condition of that Christian fellowship and communion with God, which are the distinguishing duties and privileges of the Church of Christ." Now suppose it were as you affirm, this would not make Episcopacy anti-scriptural any more than you will allow Presbyterianism to be anti-scriptural. Episcopacy excludes Presbyterian ordination just as Presbyterianism excludes congregational or lay ordination.

But this reminds me that we have one or two questions to settle in relation to your exact "position," before we can proceed with a clear mutual understanding. I take it for granted that you admit a ministry by God's appointment to be necessary to the being of a Church, and that this ministry derives its authority, not from men, nor from the Church itself, but from Christ, the head of the Church. We must, if you please, be very explicit on this point, or our discussion might soon assume a rambling and discursive character, which it is the interest (for the saving of time) and, I doubt not, the wish of us both to avoid. In the considerations you offer as "necessary for a right understanding of your position," you say that you are "not the advocate of the ecclesiastical polity of the Church to which you belong, except so far as that polity involves the ministerial rights of presbyters or parochial (i. e. parish or congregational) Bishops." Now what are these ministerial rights, and whence are they derived? I think that when you have answered these questions the Congregationalists and the Friends and some other denominations, will not find much to choose between us as "to charity," "exclusiveness," "unchurching," &c.

I presume, then, you hold to the doctrine that "the Christian ministry is essential to the Church and must always exist." I dare say that in this point we should both coincide as to what is "the spirit and letter of the Word of God." St. Jerome, the father by no means least in favor with you, says that is "not a Church which has not priests." The Lutherans, in the Confession of Augsburg, declared that "in order that we might obtain justifying faith the ministry of preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments was instituted," and they add that they condemn "the Anabaptists and others who think that men receive the Holy Spirit without the external word." Calvin argues at length in proof of the necessity of the ministry in the Church—saying that "the Church is not otherwise edified than by external preaching;" he affirms that "Christ so ordained the office of the ministry in the Church, that, were it taken away, the Church would perish." In your own confession of faith, chapter XXV., section 2d, it is asserted—"The visible Church which is also catholic or universal under the Gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ—the house and family of God—out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation"—"Unto this Catholic, visible Church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world, and doth by his own presence and spirit—according to his promise—make them effectual thereunto."

Thus Christ is represented as giving the ministry equally with the oracles and ordinances, and to the same end. In the form of government of the Presbyterian Church, Chapter III., "Of the officers of the Church," we read—"Our blessed Lord at first collected his Church out of different nations, and formed it into one body by the mission of men endowed with miraculous gifts, which have long ceased." "The ordinary and perpetual officers of the Church are Bishops or pastors," &c. And here Ephesians iv., 11, 12, is referred to as authority, where Christ is spoken of as appointing the ministry. "And he gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." As touching this point, then, we agree that a ministry, divinely appointed, is essential to the being of a Church. I presume, too, you would admit as readily that this ministry must be Apostolical; that is, derived from Christ in some way through the Apostles. An Apostolical ministry, then, you must acknowledge to be "essential (to use your own words) to the very being of a Church, so that without it there is no Church, and of course 'no ordinances, no promises of God, no lawful reliance upon God's grace, no covenanted mercies, and no just and certain hope of reaching heaven.'" Observe, I do not give all these inferences as my own. You have put them upon me as resulting from my position, that a "Bishop," or "Prelate," as you choose to quote me, is essential to the being of a Church. I am authorized, therefore, I think, to put them upon you as resulting from the doctrine we hold in common, that an Apostolical ministry is essential to the being of a Church.

You have unchurched, then, the Quakers, and left them to the uncovenanted mercies of God; you have unchurched the Congregationalists, you have unchurched the whole body of Methodists, you have unchurched large portions if not the whole of the Baptists, to the full extent that I unchurch you. Do you shrink in "horror" from a proposition "so monstrous?" If you can escape from it I shall be glad to know how. If you do not confess that this is your position, as far as I can see you must relinquish the doctrine of the ministry and the Church, as maintained, I believe, in all the reformed creeds and certainly in your own. Now this is a point upon which I should like some satisfaction. And if the result of your reconsideration of the subject should be that we symbolize on this grand point, perhaps you will agree with me that we had better not prefer against each other any charges of "uncharitableness," "exclusiveness," "unchurching," &c., but since we both agree that "there is warrant from the Word of God for making *a* particular external form of polity a condition of that Christian fellowship and communion with God which are the distinguishing duties and privileges of the Church of Christ, we calmly proceed to inquire what that external form of polity is. You will perceive that I return to you your own first argument against my position, requesting you to reconsider it and see whether it does not militate against fair inferences to be drawn from the standards of the Church to which you belong.

I should conclude my letter here, and await your answer, for I am anxious that our communications should be short, by being restricted as far as practicable to a single point, both with a view to our own convenience, and what I believe to be the public wish, but I must correct you upon one point where you have certainly greatly misapprehended my views. You say "let any one examine the tenor of the preaching of Christ and his Apostles, and then point to a solitary evidence that they placed, as you do, merely external relations upon a level with the exercise of the spiritual graces of repentance, toward God, and faith in Christ." My dear sir, I will not doubt your sincerity in making this charge, but I beseech you to examine again those expressions of mine to which you have given a construction so abhorent to my clear convictions of Christian truth. Place external relations upon a level with the exercise of spiritual graces—repentance and faith?!! Never, never, could I do this. Formalist as you may believe me to be, I beseech you make me not appear to value the body more than the soul. I believe that in this world the intimate union of both is essential to life. The body we know cannot live without the soul, nor have I ever yet learned that God has permitted a soul to exist in this probationary state without a body, but do I therefore place as high a value upon the body as the soul? By no means. I only contend that what "God hath joined together" man should not attempt to "put asunder;" if he hath said concerning his Church, there is "one Spirit," he hath also said "there is one body."

I am, Rev. and Dear Sir.
Your obedient servant,
JONA. M. WAINWRIGHT.

Wednesday, Jan. 17th.

"Though the history of a family may seem to be forgotten when the last member of it is laid in the grave, the memory of it still lives in immortal souls, and when the circle is wholly dissolved on earth, it is again completed in heaven."

NOTICES.

☞ A Spirit of Inquiry being at the present time most clearly manifest in relation to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, it is believed that a Course of Sermons on the principles by which she has ever been distinguished will be of advantage in directing inquirers to the path of truth. The Church has never departed, nor is she in danger of departing from that middle course in which she always protests against error of every kind.

In accordance with these views a Course of Sermons will be preached on Sunday evenings, during the ensuing winter in ST. PAUL'S CHAPEL, and be repeated in ST. CLEMENT'S CHURCH, in this city.

Services to commence at half past seven.

ST. PAUL'S CHAPEL, Sunday evening, January 21. Sermon by the Rev. Professor HAIGHT, on "*The Holiness of the Church.*"

ST. CLEMENT'S CHURCH, Sunday evening, January 21. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. HIGBEE, on "*The Divine Authority of the Ministry of the Church.*"

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES.—*A Course of Sermons to Young Persons.*—A number of the Clergy of the Church have kindly consented to preach in course, on Sunday evenings, in the Mission Church of the Holy Evangelists, in Vandewater street, sermons especially applicable to Young Persons.

The seventh lecture will be delivered by Rev. C. S. Henry, on Sunday evening, January 21. Service to commence at 7 o'clock. Jan. 20.

ST. SIMON'S CHAPEL.—*German Protestant Episcopal Congregation.*—Divine service in the German language will be held in the Chapel in Houston street, between Ridge and Pitt streets, on Sunday morning, at half past 10 o'clock; and in the evening, at 7 o'clock.

Friends of the Church who understand the German language are most respectfully invited to attend, and solicit the attendance of their German friends.

Sunday school at 9 o'clock, A. M., and half past 1 o'clock, P. M. Jan. 6, 1844.

MISSION CHURCH OF THE HOLY EVANGELISTS.—Donations to the Ladies' Benevolent Society of this Church are respectfully solicited; they may be left with any of the undersigned at their respective residences, or at the Church, on Tuesday evenings, from 7 to 9 o'clock, P. M.

Mrs. Evans, 360 Broome street; Mrs. Perry, 78 Beekman street; Mrs. Underhill, 266 Grand street; Mrs. Hewitt, 239 Centre street; Mrs. Pietch, 80 Warren street; Miss Bond, 375 Broadway; J. C. Faulkner, 22 Vandewater street. Jan. 6, 1844.

SECOND FRENCH CONGREGATION.—Divine worship in French, every Lord's Day, at 10½ A. M., and 7 P. M., in the Chapel situated at the corner of Nassau street and Park Row. Sunday school at 9 A. M., and singing school for children at 3 P. M.

Our American friends are respectfully requested to make this known to their French acquaintances.

C. H. WILLIAMSON,
Jan. 6, 1844. 72 Murray street.

SEAMEN'S CHAPEL.—Divine Service, according to the rites of the Protestant Episcopal Church, will be held every Sunday morning and afternoon, in the building corner of Pike and South streets, where the Bethel Flag is displayed.

The Seamen of the Port of New York are invited to attend. Morning service, 10½ A. M. Afternoon service, 3 P. M. Jan. 6, 1844.

CALENDAR.

JANUARY.

21. Third Sunday after the Epiphany.
25 The Conversion of St. Paul.
28. Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany.

FEBRUARY.

2. The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, commonly called the Purification of St. Mary the Virgin.
4. Septuagesima Sunday.
11. Sexagesima Sunday.
18. Quinquagesima Sunday.
21. The first day of Lent, commonly called ASH-WEDNESDAY.
24. St. Matthias the Apostle.
25. First Sunday in Lent.
28. Ember Day.

DIOCESAN RECORD.

EPISCOPAL ACTS BY THE BISHOP OF THIS DIOCESE.

City of New York. Second Sunday after the Epiphany, January 14th, confirmed 14 in Calvary Church.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR THE ANNUAL CONFIRMATIONS IN THE CITIES OF NEW YORK AND BROOKLYN.

Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany, January 28, Church of the Annunciation.

Sexagesima Sunday, February 11, Mission Church of St. Matthew.

First Sunday in Lent, February 25, St. Ann's Church, *Brooklyn.*

Seond Sunday in Lent, March 3, Church of the Ascension, *New York.*

Third Sunday in Lent, March 10, Church of the Redemption.

Fourth Sunday in Lent, March 17, St. Jude's Church.

Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 24, St. Paul's Chapel.

Sunday next before Easter, March 31, St. John's Chapel, A. M.; St. Bartholomew's Church, P. M.

First Sunday after Easter, April 14, St. Mark's Church.

Third Sunday after Easter, April 28, St. John's Church, *Brooklyn.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.—Since his acknowledgment of the 10th inst., the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

Legacy of James Amory Appleton, deceased, of Boston, per hands of Goodhue & Co, $1000; Christmas offerings of St John's ch, St Louis, $16; S S, do, $5; collection in St Stephen's ch, Harrisburgh, Pa, per James Peacock, Esq, half, $9; S S, do, half, $7 50; a friend to missions, $5; Christmas offerings of Emmanuel ch, Brooklyn, L I, half, $17 93; from do, specially for Maine, $6; anonymous, per Rev Mr Harris, $5; Christmas offerings of Grace ch, Newark, N J, $5 67; scholars and teachers of S S of the missionary station, Rockville, R I, per Rev T L Randolph, half, $3 50; offerings of Trinity ch, Columbia, S C, Rev P J Shand, rector, of which $1 is for Key West, $66; donation of Hon Duncan Cameron, of Raleigh, N C, $50; St George's ch, Fredericksburgh, Va, $10; Mrs C Thorn, do, $5; St John's ch, Waterbury, Conn, Rev J L Clark, rector, $50. Total, $1256 60.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
Jan. 18, 1844. 139 Broadway, New York.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.—The Treasurer of the Foreign Committee since his report of 10th inst., has received the following sums:

From St Paul's ch, Lynchbu gh, Va, $47 94; Christmas offering of S school of do, $2 06—$50; Christmas offering of St Andrew's ch, Wilmington, D C, $3 50; do, do, Trinity ch, Wilmington, $5; received from sale of trinkets received in collection at Church of the Epiphany and St Mark's ch, N Y, $6; family mite box, $10 51; legacy of James Amory Appleton of Boston, $1000; St George's ch, Fredericksburg, Va, per Rev E C M'Guire, $20; St Philip's ch, Circleville, O, per Rev A Clark, rector, $40; St John's ch, Georgetown, D C, per Rev Mr Butler, after an address by Rev Dr Savage, for Africa, $17; S school of St Bartholomew's ch, N Y, for support of Sophia Bartholomew, Africa, $20; Trinity ch, Shepherdstown, Va, for Africa, $13 18; Rev C W Andrews, for Africa, $10; for China, $5 57—$28 75; Emmanuel ch, Brooklyn, L I, per Rev K Goddard, rector, one half of Christmas collection, $17 93; for China mission, $6—$23 93; St Stephen's ch, Harrisburgh, Pa, one half, $9; Sunday sch Christmas offering, $7 50—$16 50; through Rev George Burgess, from ladies of Christ ch, Hartford, for an African child at Cape Palmas, $20; communicants of St Matthew's ch, Jersey City, per Rev Dr Barry, for China, $10; Christmas offering of S school of Grace ch, Newark, N J, $5 67. Total, $1276 86.

J. SMYTH ROGERS,
New York, January 16, 1844. Treasurer.

FUND FOR AGED AND INFIRM CLERGYMEN.—The Treasurer of the Convention has received for the "Fund for Aged and Infirm Clergymen," since acknowledgment of 10th inst., the following contributions, viz:—

From Trinity ch, Ulster, Rev Hiram Adams, rector, $11 50; St Matthew's ch, Bedford, Rev A H Partridge, rector, $2 50; Christ ch, Manhasset, Rev J P F Clarke, rector, $2 60; St Paul's ch, Glen Cove, Rev J P F Clarke, rector, $0 06; St John's ch, Cohoes, Rev Edward F Edwards, $3 75; Christ ch, New York, Rev Dr Lyell, rector, $17 32; St Anna's ch, Fishkill Landing, Rev F Clarkson, rector, $21 28; St Paul's ch, Poughkeepsie, Rev P E Mildoler, rector, $6. Total amount, $65 01.

C. N. S. ROWLAND, Treasurer
of the Convention of P. E. Church, N. Y.,
Jan. 17, 1844. 55 Water street.

MISSIONARY COMMITTEE OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.—The Treasurer has received the following contributions, since report of 10th inst., viz:—

By the hands of Mr Phillips of Goshen, $4 24; from little girls of St James's ch, Goshen, Sunday school, $0 76; a friend to N Y Episcopal missions, $3; St John's ch, Cohoes, Rev Edward F Edwards, $4 25; "Mite Society" of Christ ch, N Y, Rev Dr Lyell, rector, $25. Total amount, $37 25.

C. N. S. ROWLAND, Treasurer,
January 17, 1844. 55 Water street.

NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:—

From Bible, Prayer Book and Tract Society, Theological Seminary, $10. Rev J D Carder, $2. Rev S H Turner, $4. P R Underhill, $5. Mrs P R Underhill, of New Rochelle, $3—annual subscribers—$14. Total amount, $24.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, Jan. 17, 1844.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.—The treasurer thankfully acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:—

From Bible, Prayer Book and Tract Society, Theological Seminary, $4. Rev J D Carder, $1. Total amount, $5.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, Jan. 17, 1844.

MISSION CHURCH OF ST. MATTHEW.—The subscriber gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following sum for the benefit of the poor:

From P, through T C Butler, Esq, $10.

Further donations are respectfully solicited, and will be thankfully received if left with Stanford & Swords, 139 Broadway; Mr. T. C. Butler, 20 John street; Mr. Sparks, Churchman office, 109 Nassau street; or with Jesse Pound, 50 Fourth street.

January 17, 1844.

MISSION CHURCH OF THE EPIPHANY.—The subscriber gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following donations for the benefit of the poor:

From John D Wolfe, Esq, $30—($25 for the sick poor, $5 for the Sunday school.) By Stanford & Swords, from a lady of St Paul's chapel, a sovereign. By Thomas C Butler, Esq, from S, $10.

LOT JONES, 192 Allen-st.

N. B. Further donations will be thankfully received, They may be left with Messrs. Stanford & Swords, 139 Broadway; Thomas C Butler, Esq, Church Depository, 20 John street; James A Sparks, Esq, 109 Nassau street; or with the Missionary, 192 Allen street.

January 17, 1844.

THE CHURCH—THE FAITH—TRADITION. By BENJ. T. ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New York.

The above sermon, introductory to the course of lectures now being delivered in St. Paul's Chapel and St. Clement's Church, is just published, and is for sale, price one shilling, at 4 John street.

ONDERDONK & FORREST, Publishers.
Jan. 20.—2t

PECK'S BOOKSTORE,
No. 158 Main street, (Exchange Buildings,)
WM. B. PECK, } Buffalo, N. Y.
CHS. E. PECK, }

CHURCH BOOKS published by James A. Sparks and D. Appleton & Co., constantly on hand, at publishers' prices. Jan. 20—6m

WORKS ON EPISCOPACY.

DR. BOWDEN'S LETTERS to Dr. Miller; Dr. Cooke on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination and Episcopacy, tested by Scripture, in two volumes, in boards, and bound in sheep; also, Leslie on Deism; West on the Resurrection; Walton's Lives; Gibson's Letters; Life of Bishop Heber, &c., for sale at low prices at the Church Depository, 20 John street, by THOMAS C. BUTLER.
January 20.

INTERESTING PUBLICATION, having special connexion with the present controversy between EPISCOPACY and PRESBYTERIANISM.

An Apology for Apostolic Order and its Advocates, in a series of letters addressed to the Rev. John M. Mason, D. D., by the late Bishop Hobart. Price 50 cents. Just published and for sale by
STANFORD & SWORDS,
Jan. 13—4t 139 Broadway.

CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY.
(*Recommended to patronage by the Bishops of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York.*)

A SERIES of publications, original and from the English press, in Monthly Numbers of 56 octavo pages each, on fine paper, at $2 25 a year, payable, by city subscribers, on delivery of the numbers. Mail subscribers $2, or six copies sent to one address $10, enclosed in advance, to the Publisher. Postmasters are authorized to remit for periodicals. The following works will be embraced in the series:—

A History of the English Reformation, by Massingberd; Christian Morals, by Sewell; St. Antholin's, or Old Churches and New, by Paget; Bowden's Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII.; Lives of Eminent English Laymen, by Teale; The Great Necessity and Advantage of Public Prayer and Frequent Communion, by Bishop Beveridge; Manning's Sermons; Church Clavering, or The School-Master, by Gresley; Life of Wm. Wilberforce, abridged, by his Sons; Travels in the East, by Rev. H. Formby, &c.

The first number for December is out, and the January number is in press, containing the English Reformation. J. R. DUNHAM.
JAMES A SPARKS,
109 Nassau-st, Gen. Agent for the city of N. York.

PUBLICATION OF THE SERMONS now in course of delivery in St. Paul's Chapel, and St. Clement's Church, New York.

The undersigned propose to publish the above sermons, separately, in pamphlet form, upon fine paper, and with good type, as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made therefor. The first sermon of the course, by Bishop B. T. Onderdonk, entitled "The Church—the Faith—Tradition," is now in press, and will be issued in a few weeks. Booksellers and agents out of the city, will have their orders, if *post paid*, punctually attended to.

ONDERDONK & FORREST,
Publishers, 4 John st.

The Utica Gospel Messenger, the Banner of the Cross, the True Catholic, and the Southern Churchman, are requested to give the above three conspicuous insertions, and send their bills to the office of the advertisers. Jan 6—3t

PEW WANTED.—A Pew wanted in St. John's Church. Address A. J. Jun., box 298 Lower Post Office. Jan. 6 2t

PALMER'S LETTERS TO WISEMAN, complete in one volume.
JAMES A. SPARKS,
Dec. 9. Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau st.

BUDS, BLOSSOMS, AND FRUITS OF THE CHURCH; or, Born in the Church, Baptized in the Church, &c. By a Candidate for Orders.
JAMES A. SPARKS,
Dec. 9. Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau st.

CHEAP QUARTO BIBLES. A lot of cheap quarto Bibles with the Apocrapha, just received and for sale. Prices from $1 50 to $2 50.
JAMES A. SPARKS,
Dec. 2. Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau-st.

ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, edited by Rev. Dr. Wainwright, and published by Mr. Hewet is now completed, and for sale. Price $8.50. J. A. SPARKS, Churchman's Bookstore
109 Nassau street. Jan. 6.

JUST PUBLISHED,

A NEW WORK by Rev. William Palmer. A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times, with reflections on existing tendencies to Romanism, and on the present duties and prospects of members of the Church. By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford, author of "a Treatise on the Church of Christ," "Letters to Dr. Wiseman," &c. From the Oxford Edition. A pamphlet of about 100 pages.
JAMES A. SPARKS,
Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau street.
Nov. 18, 1843.

RARE AND VALUABLE THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

THE following catalogue of Rare and Valuable Works are on sale for a Clergyman whose pressing wants compel him, reluctantly, to part with them:

Burkitt's Commentary, 2 vols. quarto.
Stewart & Winar's Greek and Hebrew Grammar, 1 vol. octavo.
Scott's Commentaries, 6 vols.
Bishop Rider on the Bible, 3 vols. folio.
Lectures on the Destiny of the Jews. London ed.
Horn's Commentary on the Psalms.
JAMES A. SPARKS,
Nov. 11. Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau-st.

POETRY.

For the Churchman.

The following lines were suggested by the recent illness and decease of one whose lovely character and shining qualities endeared her to many hearts; but whom the Almighty has seen fit to summon home to heaven before she had experienced the trials and difficulties of this earthly pilgrimage, or scarcely tasted of that bitter cup from which the lips of maturity *cannot* turn away:* —

So *soon* return'd, thou gloomy Messenger
From the mysterious, far off Spirit land?
Alas! in yonder dwelling, lingers yet
The echo of thy desolating step;
And still the dusky shadow of the grave
Is resting on its walls. O turn aside!
Nor quite obscure the feeble sunshine left.
Why wert thou sent to pluck another gem
From Hope's fair coronet? another flower
To rifle from the parent stem, that still
Hangs drooping o'er the bud so lately crush'd?
Forbear, thou fell Destroyer of our race!
To "break the bruised reed." This opening flower
Watch'd over with such fond solicitude;
Nourish'd so tenderly; so well beloved;
Leave yet awhile on our terrestrial soil.
We know its native place is in the skies;
We know that far too pure and delicate
Our cherish'd blossom for a world like this;
But human hearts are weak, and e'en the love
Most pure not all unselfish: Hard it is
To loose our hold of what we dearly prize,
Though Faith point upward to a brighter home,
Whose open door is waiting for the soul,
That struggles in the arms of earthly love,
To enter in and be forever bless'd.
Then spare that little band so fondly link'd
By Love's most holy tie—they *cannot* part:
The world is harsh and selfish, and her power,
Her mocking smile, and ever changing tone
Sicken the spirit and destroy its trust.
They have been wounded by her faithlessness,
And in each other's arms have sought the rest
Denied them on her cold capricious breast.
Heart has been knit to heart: and day by day
That sacred bond of union stronger grown,
And harder to be broken. Do not dim
The beauty of that silver chain, or force
With cruel hand its glittering links apart.
Revere the anguish of that stricken pair;
Pity those young, frail forms, that silently
Bend o'er the couch of suffering innocence,
With woe too deep for utterance.
Alas!
He will not heed affection's earnest prayer,
Death's unrelenting Angel! He has press'd
His icy hand upon that heaving breast,
And still'd the pulse of life. The throbbing brow
Grows cold as marble; and the ashy lips
Murmur a parting blessing ere they close—
The latest efforts of expiring love—
And all is over.
Leave them with the dead:—
For none may venture now to sympathize;
None offer comfort in an hour like this.
Let the o'erburden'd heart dissolve in tears;
The pent up agony, endured so long,
Burst forth at last—a heavy, heavy loss
Is theirs to mourn, and heaven forbids them not.
But when these bitter drops, now falling fast
Upon that lifeless form, are wiped away,
They can look calmly backward on the past,
And gratitude will mingle with regret
To mark the rainbow hues, the sunny smiles,
That light up memory's picture; no dark stain,
No guilty shadows to appal and grieve,
But pure and beautiful, the image there,
As yon blue heaven to which her soul has flown.
A peace the unquiet world can neither give
Nor take away, shall fill those sorrowing hearts.
A holy faith is theirs—a glorious hope,
Which raise the voyager on life's wide sea
Above the swell of its tumultuous waves
Which roar unceasingly around his path,
But cannot overwhelm. A little while
To bear with change and trouble; a few days
To journey o'er a fearful, dangerous path;
One fatal cup to drain, the last, the last
Of mortal suffering, and—the scene is closed—
All, all gone by, when dust returns to dust.
A brighter world shall open on the eyes
That closed in sadness here; another life,
All purity and bliss, will then begin
The just shall meet again, to part no more.
The Serpent and his offspring Death, shall lie
Crush'd low beneath the conquering feet of Him
Who is "the Resurrection and the Life."
The blessed of the Lord, "the dead in Christ,"
Shall slumber sweetly till the final hour,
Then lay her down to rest. She yet shall live
Even *here* in faithful hearts: a thousand things
Shall call her back; those loving eyes
Now sealed in darkness, still shall mildly beam
With more than earthly radiance thro' their dreams;
And oft in "Memory's moonlight hour" the tones
Of that dear voice, like music from the land
Of perfect harmony, shall soothe their souls.
She is not lost. Around their daily paths
Her spirit, though unseen, may hover still;
Still, though they know it not, may sympathize
With the beloved of earth, still minister
With more than former tenderness; and still
Watch o'er and guide them in the way to Heaven.

Cooperstown, Nov. 30th, 1843. C. A. R.

* Mary M., daughter of the Rev. Frederick T. Tiffany, of Cooperstown, N. Y.

From the Commercial Advertiser.

THERE CANNOT BE A CHURCH WITHOUT A PRELATE.

FOURTH LETTER TO DR. WAINWRIGHT.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—Before I have concluded this letter in answer to yours of the 8th inst., our readers will have discovered that it is not my purpose to retard the discussion of your proposition, by insisting upon the merely technical question, who shall, by the laws of fence, commence the discussion. I will commence it; but in doing so, I mean to hold you strictly to the proposition you have thrown out as a defiance, and to keep yourself and our readers in mind that mine is an attitude of self-defence, against an assault, and an unprovoked assault, upon the character and rights of the great mass of our Christian fellow citizens.

In my last I think it was shown conclusively that this was the case. You seem to have a suspicion that the close of my letter, which indeed contained the gist of the matter, was well "adapted for my purpose or popular effect." You profess not indeed to see its *relevancy*, but I think others have not failed to perceive that my statement of the circumstances convicts you of having made a gratuitous attack upon all who do not think that Prelates only can open the gates of the Christian Church. "My purpose," I admit, was "popular effect;" and I feel complimented by your thinking that my argument has achieved my purpose. The reason of its fitness for "popular effect" is not to be found in any special skill upon my part in stating the facts, but in the nature of the facts themselves. In a simple matter of fact, the best judge is the common sense of common people. I perceive that you do not yourself call in question the force of my argument, that as there was confessedly nothing in Mr. Choate's language, and nothing in the applause of the audience, which invaded *your* ecclesiastical standing, so you were not called upon, especially upon that occasion, to attack the ecclesiastical standing of the general community of Christians.

You will understand me, however; I do not think that the inappropriateness of time and place is the worst feature in this case of ecclesiastical proscription. It is the utter unreasonableness and the unrelieved moral deformity of the unchurching dogma, which, in my view, constitute its offensive character. I admire boldness, but not in a bad cause; and I hold that to be, *prima facie*, a bad cause, which, either in the pulpit of one of your churches, or at the dinner table of the Astor House, prompts any man thus to assail the Church standing, including the faith, hopes and rights, of his fellow Christians. When you set up a claim, not to superiority, but to a *monopoly* of the privileges belonging to the house of God—when you set up this claim in behalf of a mere fraction, a molecule, of the Protestant community—and when such confessedly stupendous consequences are necessarily involved in the claim—it cannot escape the most unobservant reader, that to make out such a claim, its advocates ought to be prepared with proof, little short of *mathematical demonstration*. And yet, as I shall hereafter more fully show, the extravagance of the claim is equalled only by the contradictory, indefinite, and I must add the absolutely ridiculous character of many of the arguments which are employed to sustain it. This aggravates the unprovoked assault you have chosen to make, and if, in the course of my future remarks, I shall speak of the High Church dogma as it deserves, I shall hold myself absolved from blame as an aggressor.

Before I proceed to do for you, what you decline to do for yourself, i. e. define the terms of your own proposition so that the *reader* may understand them, (for I shall show you that I myself understand pretty well the sense you affix to them,) there are two little pieces of history, given in your last letter, which call for criticism.

The *first* is that in which you are giving an account of the origin of this discussion, for the purpose of "letting the public understand what are our respective positions." It runs thus:—"Upon leaving my study one morning, for the discharge of my parochial duties, I am informed in the street, to my great surprise, that a letter has been addressed to me in a public print by the Rev. Dr. Potts. It is put into my hand," &c. &c. This history wants the title-page, and a few of the first leaves. Will it not be better to supply the hiatus and begin at the beginning? It would be more complete if it commenced by recording the polite invitation which led you to the New England festival; the speech of the New England orator; the applause which accompanied him throughout, and which offended you so deeply, when he gave a sort of ecclesiastical genealogy of his forefathers; your determination to rebuke the orator and the audience, by declaring your belief, not that you had a better genealogy, but that their genealogy was absolutely spurious; your taking occasion two or three hours after, (when it might be supposed that you had had time for deliberation,) to avow that if the orator of the day should challenge you, you would prove that of the "clergy of New England," who had just been toasted, there were none justly entitled to the name, except "the sainted Cheverus," and the "meek Prelate of your own Church," with their several subordinates of the Papist and Protestant priesthood; that this attack upon the self respect and sensibilities of nineteen-twentieths, if not more, of your fellow citizens—I am almost afraid to say fellow Christians—was published throughout the land; and *then* that *after all this had come to pass*, and you had perhaps congratulated yourself that you had chastised Yankee impertinence—*then*—"upon leaving your study one morning," &c. &c. &c. Is not the record unfair until these few little items are prefixed to it? I will leave to the reader to say, whether the above be not the true genesis of the present discussion.

The *second* piece of history, which is open to animadversion more severe than I can administer, is that which informs us of the comparative antiquity, and universality of the motto which "you bear upon your shield:" "*No Church without a Prelate.*" At the very unqualified claim you make in respect to this motto I would express my *wonder, surprise, astonishment*, &c., &c., were I not tired of that common practice of disputants, a very efficient thing in rhetoric, but useless in logic. Whatever my wonder may be, I will not utter it. Besides which, after having seen how familiarity with extravagant statements often obliterates the intellectual sensibilities, just as a long familiarity with an offensive odor blunts the sense of smell, I have no longer a right even to feel surprise at the occurrence of such a phenomenon; no right to wonder that one, who had brought his mind to brave the consequences of the adoption of the unchurching dogma, should first of all find it easy to assert in a promiscuous company that Prelacy was of the very essence of the Church of God, and then subsequently, that this doctrine was "*borne on the banner of the Universal Church, without challenge or dispute*, 1600 *years.*" Now this *is* a wonderful statement. I might show that so far is this from being true, the doctrine of monopoly—as I shall call it for the sake of brevity, and to distinguish it from true catholicity—is not countenanced by the voice of antiquity, that there were writers who distinctly denied it, and whole Churches, the Waldensian for instance, which always refused even to admit the element of Prelacy into their constitution; and all this long before the glorious Reformation. This is unquestionable; but that the reader may not rely upon the assertion of one, who, he may suppose, "uses words at random," I will quote, from a disinterested witness, a single sentence; I will set the authority of the learned prelate Stillingfleet over against that of Dr. Wainwright. These are his words: "I do despair of finding one single testimony in all 'antiquity,' which doth in plain terms assert episcopacy as it was settled by the practice of the primitive Church, in ages following the Apostles, *to be of unalterable divine right.*" So much for the "unchallenged, undisputed" antiquity and universality of your motto.

But leaving these things for future consideration, I proceed to the most alarming part of your last communication—I mean that in which I am warned, in capital letters, of a horned dilemma which is goring me. It may be obtuseness in me, but I must confess I do not see these tremendous horns.

My "modest" call for your own definition of the terms of a proposition which you *volunteered* to maintain, and which is the basis of this discussion, was dictated by the wish to put *our readers* in possession of your meaning in your own words. As to myself I had a shrewd notion of their meaning. The proposition is capable of *two* senses; but from the very circumstances in which you announced it, I am myself at no loss as to your real meaning. But I have heretofore imagined that no discussion could be carried on without a mutual understanding as to the sense in which the parties mean to use the principal terms and phrases. How long is it since this apparently indispensable preliminary has been expunged from the laws of debate?

Why you should manifest a reluctance "to commence the discussion by defining your terms," which is all I asked of you, is more than I will undertake to explain. But as you decline doing this, and as I must contrive some way of coming to an understanding as to the true *status quæstionis*, and the sense which our readers are to fix to its *terms*, I propose to waive even this right, and to do your work for you, rather than to waste time in an idle war of words. In doing this, I shall at the same time state wherein your definitions and mine differ in meaning.

First: What is the meaning of the word CHURCH in your proposition? I am quite willing to take the definition of your own articles, which is as follows: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all things that are of necessity requisite to the same.'—Art. 19. This, however, does not fully express the high Church claims, inasmuch as it does not declare, (as it ought, if the doctrine of monopoly were true) that there cannot *be* a congregation of faithful men, and that the true word of God *cannot* be preached, nor the sacraments *duly administered*, &c., except under "the regimen of Prelates." This the framers of your articles studiously avoided saying, for it is well known that the English Reformers fraternized with the Reformed Churches of the continent of Europe. Since the time of Laud, however, the "no Prelate, no Church" dogma has been held by an increasing number of your communion, with more or less earnestness, although never without resistance upon the part of others, until it must be admitted that at the present time there is probably a majority of Anglican and American Prelatists, who hold the extreme views and maintain that Prelacy is,—not simply scriptural and useful, and therefore the best model of ecclesiastical polity—but *essential to the very being* of a Church.

Of this number you are one; and the following is the gloss you must put upon your Church article, just quoted. The Church is a congregation of faithful men, and the pure word of God is preached in it, and it alone has the sacraments duly administered, *because* it has Prelates, through whom, as the delegates of Christ, and the direct successors of the Apostles, the inferior orders of the ministry receive a right to preach and grace to administer Christian ordinances efficaciously. In other words, the statements of these extreme Prelatists warrant us in saying that though men may believe, teach and practice *all else* contained in the word of God, yet if they reject Prelacy, they are not in the Church of God at all, and if saved at all (of which some speak hopefully, but others doubtfully) must be saved "as by fire," upon some undefinable principles of mercy upon which nothing that is said in the Gospel will justify them in relying.

Do I misrepresent your views of the indispensableness of Prelacy to the very existence of a Church? If so, you could have prevented the possibility of misrepresentation, had you, according to my reasonable call, defined your terms in your own language. This you can still do.

Secondly: What is the definition of the office and functions of *a* "BISHOP."

In your theory a Bishop is the highest of three grades of clergy:—Bishops, priests and deacons. He is set over a particular section or diocese, as its ecclesiastical head, and is invested with certain exclusive rights, which rights are thus stated by a Prelate: "The right to ordain and confirm, that of general supervision in a diocese, and that of the chief administration of discipline; besides enjoying all the powers of the other grades."—(Dr. H. U. Onderdonk.) In virtue of the last two of these rights, expressed with an indefinite comprehensiveness which we will examine at a subsequent stage in the discussion, the Prelate has been known even to claim a control over the proceedings and minutes of a Convention.

Farther, in order to the right institution of "a Bishop," in your sense of the term, he must have received his ordination from other Prelates, and they again from others, so that an unbroken chain may convey the Episcopal grace from the Apostles themselves. This is the far-famed Apostolical succession, of which so much has been made of late years. Why this chain is considered of such consequence may be seen by the reader if he will peruse the following quotations; two out of a multitude which I have at hand. The first is from a well-known champion of Prelacy, Dodwell, in the following *moderate* terms. I beg the particular notice of the reader. "None but the Bishops can unite us to the Father and the Son. Whence it will follow, that whosoever is disunited from the visible communion of the Church on earth, and *particularly* from the visible communion of the *Bishops*, must consequently be disunited from the whole visible Catholic Church upon earth; and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven, and, what is more, *from Christ and God himself.* It is one of the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the *damned*, that they are banished from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power. The SAME is their condition also who are disunited from Christ, by being disunited from *his visible representative*."

The former Prelate of this diocese, Dr. Hobart, in his "Companion for the Altar," speaks the following language; it is equally kind as the foregoing:—"But where the Gospel is proclaimed, communion with the Church, by the participation of its ordinances, at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood, is *the indispensable condition of salvation*,"—making a soothing exception in favor of schismatics and dissenters, who separate themselves from the regular priesthood through "*involuntary* ignorance and error."

I do not mean to discuss these monstrosities now, but will only add here that the ground upon which such assumptions are made is, that from the Apostles the Bishops alone derive Episcopal grace, which they communicate to the inferior clergy in ordination, and which, through the ministrations of the inferior clergy, is communicated to the people in baptism and the holy Eucharist, by the former of which a spiritual life is given, while by the latter that spiritual life is fed and sustained.

On the other hand, our definition of "a Bishop" makes him nothing more than a pastor or overseer of a particular congregation, who is, in all official respects, upon an equality with other pastors; who, in administering the discipline of the house of God, is associated with officers who are elected by the people, and who, in administering the ordinances of the Gospel, pretends to be no more than the ministrator of emblematic ordinances, whose virtue as seals of the covenant depends altogether upon the faith of the recipients. Ordination, whether with or without the imposition of hands, is no more than a public and formal setting apart of a suitable individual to the work of the ministry, and is performed by his predecessors in the ministry. The case of those Churches which have elected one out of the number of ministers to exercise certain supervisory powers over the rest, as is the fact in the Methodist and Lutheran Churches, is not an exception to the doctrine of the essential parity or equality of their ministers. These bodies do not claim a divine right for their Bishops or superintendents.

And now, finally, what do you mean by the CATHOLIC CHURCH? It is a phrase found in your former letters, and will probably occur again. I shall understand you to mean by it that portion of Christendom in which the above views as to the indispensableness of Prelacy are to be found. That is, you hold that the Prelatical bodies alone constitute the Catholic Church. The Romish, the Greek, the Armenian and other Eastern Churches, together with the English and American Prelatists, are the only component parts of this Church. And their catholicity, let the reader observe, consists not in purity of doctrine or forms of worship, (for you hold all those I have named, except your own, to be more or less corrupt;) but in their being governed by Prelates. This is the essential element of their catholicity, this their redeeming excellence, this their evidence of being "in covenant with God."

On the other hand, in *our* view of catholicity, you will find the main stress laid upon the maintenance of the essential doctrines of the scheme of redemption, and not upon the presence or absence of any external form of polity. We admit that even Prelacy does not vitiate the character of a Church, although we think it has proved itself to be a foreign and unwholesome element in the great Christian body. Thus, the reader will perceive that while our catholicity proves its comprehensiveness by embracing all of every name whose recognised creeds do not absolutely reject the fundamentals of Christian religion, yours renounces all who do not admit the single item of Prelacy. Which of these views best deserves the name, let the reader judge.

I close my letter by saying that if I had been privileged to meet you face to face, I should have exercised "the freedom" at which you seem to look with much distaste, of insisting at once upon your obligation to give these definitions of your terms, and thus have saved myself the task of trying to reach the point thus indirectly, and the necessity of *waiting* for your answer. If you refuse to give me your definitions, or to correct those I have given, I shall hold myself at liberty to consider you as shrinking from the contest.

All the skirmishing in your last communication, as to who is, technically speaking, the challenger, is of little consequence. I am resolved not to postpone the discussion of the monstrous proposition you have endorsed, by disputing as to who shall appropriate this title. I do not feel, I assure you, the least inclination to accept the "liberty to recede," which you kindly hint at, but will rather waive all petty questions of chivalry, quite certain that, from the beginning to the end of this discussion, it will be seen that mine is the attitude of defence, and yours that of an assailant of the common principles of all anti-Prelatical Christendom. This is the important consideration.

I am, Rev. and dear sir,
Your obd't servant,
Jan. 10. GEORGE POTTS.

REV. DR. WAINWRIGHT TO REV. DR. POTTS.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—In concluding my last letter to you I said that I would not be either "enticed or driven from the position I occupied when you called upon me." Notwithstanding your pertinacious use of both these modes of controversial warfare, I stand there still, and *there* I mean to stand. You shall "hold me as strictly" as you please to the proposition I have thrown out. I wish to be held there. But you shall not hold me to assent to your charge that this proposition was thrown out "as a defiance," or that yours is the "attitude of self-defence against an unprovoked assault." I have denied this before—I deny it again—if repeated, I shall henceforth deny it as *a slander*. I uttered "no defiance." I attempted no "ecclesiastical proscription." I "unchurched" no denomination of Christians. God forbid that I, or any of those who symbolize with me in religious belief, should be guilty of such arrogance toward their fellow men; or, what is more dreadful, such bold assumption of the sole prerogative of God. The Church is His, and He has constituted it according to His own will. Those who do not conform to its requisitions unchurch themselves. Instead of all this stale declamation, so often repeated to excite popular prejudice—so often answered—PROVE from Scripture and ancient authors that Bishops are not essential to the constitution of the Christian Church, and then your work will be done, and effectually done. But until you have accomplished this, all the charges in which you so liberally indulge about "exclusiveness, uncharitableness, monopoly of privileges, unchurching," &c., are utterly irrelevant, and only calculated (I will not say designed) to divert the public mind from the true issue.

Enough of this, however. Let me recal you once more to your true position. In your letter of December 27th you say, "I will hold myself ready, (should you admit that the reporter of your speech has not done you injustice at least in this particular,) to prove that this proposition, (viz., there cannot be a Church, &c.,) is pregnant with innumerable evil consequences, social and civil; and that it is *unscriptural, uncharitable, schismatical*, and *anti-republican* in its character." I admit the correctness of the report. Issue is then joined, and what you have undertaken to prove is set forth in distinct and emphatic terms. You certainly will not say that you did not understand what you undertook to prove. You say, moreover, that "you are at no loss as to my real meaning." You have then laid your work out for yourself. Begin to execute it, if that is your pleasure. My part of the work I shall manage in my own way, and when I come to use terms I will leave you at no loss as to their meaning.

As to the "two little pieces of history" to which you allude, the first, in the modern department, is really too small a matter to make it worth my while to show how utterly disingenuous your representation is. As to the piece of ancient history, containing the allusion to the Waldenses, and to Bishop Stillingfleet, if you are indeed as ignorant as you appear to be on these points, and have implicitly followed Dr. Mason and Dr. Miller, without taking pains to acquaint yourself with the unanswered and unanswerable counter statements of Bishop Hobart and Dr. Bowden, I will in due time, when the questions come up in their proper place, endeavor to throw some light upon them for your benefit.

My wish now is simply to let the public know, through my letter to you, as you avow that "popular effect" is your object, that to you are they indebted for this unfortunate, and I may add unworthy exhibition of two clergymen contending in the public newspapers about a question which has been discussed over and over again, and access to the ablest popular arguments upon both sides of which is very easy, by reason of the republication in cheap forms of "Miller's Letters," &c., "Bowden's Letters" in reply, and "Hobart's Apology for Apostolic order and its advocates." I assert that to you, and to you alone, is it owing that we are both placed in this, which I will cheerfully acknowledge to be "an unenviable position;" that to you is it owing that we are both subjected to the ribald remarks of licentious tongues and pens, and the sober disapprobation of a large portion of the secular press; that to you is it owing that our common friends and a large portion of the pious and sober-minded of all denominations feel deep regret and mortification. My course was inevitable. You challenged me to controversy upon the credit of a common newspaper report; you took no private and friendly means to ascertain its accuracy; when the circumstances of the case were laid before you, you refused to be convinced, and you still refuse. Your character and standing in the community were so respectable, that I should have been a traitor to my own, if I had shrunk even in thought from your defiance. I have met it, and I stand ready to abide all its consequences. You now yield the point we have thus far contended for, ungraciously as I cannot help thinking, but you yield it. You say you "will commence," and thus, with the affirmative, have assumed the responsibility of the aggressor and the defier. Proceed.

I beg you now proceed to the *proof*. And I take the liberty to beg you also to proceed upon the *purely scriptural and historical merits of the question*, and in a Christian spirit, avoiding, (as I for my part by God's help intend to do,) all personalities, all injurious epithets, and all appeals to mere prejudice and passion. Injurious epithets decide nothing; for if my doctrine should be God's truth what can they avail? Appeals to mere prejudice and passion decide nothing; they cannot put my doctrine in the wrong, any more than the universal clamor of all Ephesus put St. Paul's doctrine in the wrong. My views of Christian truth, you are bound to believe, are as sincerely and conscientiously held as your own. And wherever they are "*exclusive*" as toward yourself or others, I assert, (what certainly you have no right to deny,) that they are held in my own feelings as CHARITABLY as yours can be, where the latter are exclusive as toward various other highly respectable bodies of professing Christians. I have the honor to be, Rev. and dear sir, respectfully yours,

JONA. M. WAINWRIGHT.

Friday, Jan. 12th.

ORGAN MANUFACTORY, Anthony street, New York. Mr. JARDINE has the pleasure of submitting the following testimonial:

St. Albans, Vt., November 28, 1843.

Sir,—We feel it a privilege as well as a duty we owe you, that we award our testimony of very decided approbation and praise in favor of the Organ just built and erected by yourself in our Church edifice; presented to the church by the very generous and estimable lady of our worthy Rector, Mrs. Ann D. Hoit.

And we can assure you, dear sir, that in this, we have expressed the universal opinion of all who have listened to its most delightful and thrilling tones. The beauty of design, proportions, and style of finish, its full, rich, sweet and melodious tones, we are sure cannot be excelled in one of its size and variety.

Very respectfully,
Gardner G. Smith, S. P. Eastman, H. B. Sowles, Bildad Paull, } Wardens and Vestry of the Parish of Union Church, St. Albans.
To Mr. George Gardine, Organ Builder, New York.

The above Instrument is in a Black Walnut Case, of Gothic design—has two rows of Manuals, 14 stops, and Pedal Bass to CCC.

He begs to state that he has been awarded for the last six successive years the highest Premiums of the American Institute, for the best Organs.

And from his long experience as a practical finisher in this country, and also in two of the largest Organ Manufactories in London, he warrants his Organs fully equal, if not superior—and from 10 to 20 per cent cheaper than can be obtained elsewhere in this city.

A variety of Church and Parlor, and Church Barrel Organs constantly on hand. Dec. 9.

ORGANS.—The subscriber offers for sale the following Organs:—One Organ in a Grecian case, 10 feet 6 inches high, 6 feet 6 inches wide, and 3 feet 9 inches deep, with a general swell—compass of keys from GG. to F. in Alt. Stops as follows: Open Diapason, Stop Diapason Bass, Stop Diapason Treble, Principal Fifteenth and Trumpet; a pedal to take off the chorus stops.

Two Organs same as above with the exception, the compass of the keys from CC to F, in Alt—dimensions of case 9 feet 5 inches high, 6 feet wide, and 3 feet 6 inches deep.

A second hand Church Organ, 9 feet high, 5 feet 6 inches wide, and 3 feet deep.

A second hand Parlor Organ.

HENRY ERBEN,
Oct. 1—tf 172 Centre st., head of Canal st.

ORGAN BUILDING.—THOMAS HALL, (formerly of Philadelphia, and more recently of the firm of Hall & Erben,) Church and Parlor Organ Builder, informs his friends and the public, that he is prepared to execute orders for ORGANS of every description, at his Manufactory, No. 86 Wooster street, near Spring, at short notice, and at reduced prices.

From the long experience the subscriber has had in the business of Organ building, he flatters himself he can furnish instruments of a quality at least equal to the productions of any other builders in the United States. Orders for Tuning and Repairing punctually attended to.

THOMAS HALL,
No. 80 and 86 Wooster street,
Dec. 9—yly. near Spring.

TRINITY SCHOOL,
No. 76 Varick Street.
REV. WILLIAM MORRIS, RECTOR.

THIS Institution consists of a CLASSICAL and an ENGLISH Department.

In the former, pupils shall go through a thorough course of Classical and English Education.

In the latter, strict attention will be paid to the preparation of young gentlemen for commercial pursuits.

In both departments religious instruction shall be given, both of a general nature, and specially in the doctrines and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Academic Term consists of twelve weeks. Tuition fees payable in advance. No deduction for absence.

History, Elocution, Composition, Astronomy, Philosophy, Chemistry, Mathematics, Orthography, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography, and Grammar,	$10 00
Latin and Greek, including the English course,	12 50
French, Spanish, &c., each,	5 00
Stationary,	0 50
Fuel for the season,	1 00

The 1st Term will commence Sept. 1, and end Nov. 23.
2d do. " Nov. 24, " Feb. 15.
3d do. " Feb. 16, " May 9.
4th do. " May 10, " July 31.

TRUSTEES.
Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D., President; Rev. Thomas Lyell, D. D.; Rev. William Berrian, D. D.; Rev. John McVickar, D. D.; Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D.; Rev. Joseph H. Price; Rev. Lot Jones; Rev. J. M. Wainwright, D. D.; Rev. T. H. Taylor, D. D.; Rev. B. I. Haight; Rev. E. Y. Higbee, D. D.; Thomas L. Ogden; Benjamin M. Brown; Murray Hoffman; Wm. H. Harison; Abel T. Anderson; John Stearns, M. D.; W. H. Hobart, M. D.; C. N. S. Rowland; Anthony J. Bleecker; John W. Mitchell. October 21.

TIRNITY CHURCH CEMETERY, AT MANHATTANVILLE.

THIS Cemetery is now ready for interments in graves or in vaults. It contains twenty-four acres of land, running from the Tenth Avenue to the Hudson River, and between 153d and 155th streets. The soil is of the best quality for the purpose, and to those who have not seen it, it may be necessary to say that the beauties of the place, and its rural and picturesque scenery, cannot be surpassed. The Tenth Avenue in front of the grounds has been opened, and a dock has been built on the river at the foot of 155th street. That portion of the grounds fronting the Tenth Avenue is intended for more immediate use for graves, vaults, and family burial places; but places for vaults can also be had, (if preferred,) in that portion nearest the river, which is covered with a fine open wood, and parts of it about 170 feet above high water descending gradually to the river.

Applications for interments should be made as early as convenient to Mr. Morison, Sexton, at the Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church streets. The prices for graves and for vaults and family burial grounds have been fixed at the lowest rate. For further information, and for the charges attending interments, apply to Mr. Morison as above. August 12—tf.

THE HISTORY OF A POCKET PRAYER-BOOK, written by itself. New edition. Just received and for sale by

JAMES A. SPARKS,
Nov. 11. Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau st.

ST. THOMAS' HALL, FLUSHING.

THE REV. WM. M. CARMICHAEL, D. D., Rector of St. George's Church, Hempstead, and GERARDUS BEEKMAN DOCHARTY, A. M., Principal of the Hempstead Seminary, having purchased the Institution known as ST. THOMAS' HALL, late the property of Reverend Francis L. Hawks, D. D., would respectfully inform their friends and the public generally, that they will reopen the same for the reception of students, on MONDAY, THE 6TH OF NOVEMBER NEXT, and that they will spare neither pains nor expense to render it in every way worthy of patronage.

Its elegant situation, the pleasantness and salubrity of the village in which it is located; its ready access at all times to the city of New York, are so well known that they need no comment.

For particulars in regard to terms, &c.—reference may be had to either of the Rectors at the Hall, or to the printed circulars, or by applying to any of the following gentlemen:

Rt. Rev. Benj. T. Onderdonk, D. D., New York.
Rev. Dr. Taylor, Rector of Grace Church.
Rev. Dr. Ogilby, Prof. in the Theological Seminary.
Rev. Dr. Seabury, Editor of the Churchman.
Rev. Dr. Moore, Richmond, Staten Island.
Hon. David S. Jones, New York.
Messrs. S. D. Skillin, D. Clarkson, Dr. Lucius Comstock, O. T. & J. Hewlett, Swords & Stanford, New York.
Messrs. Jarvis Brush, A. Van Nostrand, Brooklyn.
Rt. Rev. Henry U. Onderdonk, D. D., Philadelphia.
Rev. Dr. Ducachet, "
Rev. Dr. Coleman, "
Rev. Frederic Ogilby, "
Rt. Rev. William R. Whittingham, D. D., Baltimore.
October 28.

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY THE
GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,
DEPOSITORY, No. 20 JOHN STREET, NEW YORK.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

Union Primer, perhundred,		$3 00
Prot Epis S S Book, No. 1, per hundred		1 38
" " " 2,	"	1 75
" " " 3,	"	2 00
" " " 4,	"	5 00
Questions on the S S Books.	"	5 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,) per hun.		1 38
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 50
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,)	"	5 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	3 00
Church Catechism,	"	1 25
First Truths,	"	2 50
Duty to GOD,	"	0 50
Church Primer,	"	1 38
Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"	1 75
Harmony of the Creeds,	"	2 25
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 25
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"	2 00
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"	25 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	8 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2. stiff covers,	"	10 00
Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	20 00
" " Vol. 2, New do	"	22 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers,	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	10 00
Questions on The Acts, 1, "	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	8 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child,	"	2 50

A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

The PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LIBRARY, 76 vols. 18mo.—nett price 20 cents each.

THE SAME, bound in 139 volumes of various prices.—Total, $18 90 nett.

The CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, bound in 28 volumes of 144 pages each, price for the set, $5 80 nett.

The JUVENILE LIBRARY, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 85 cents nett.

Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to
DANIEL DANA, Jr., Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John st.
New York, March 18, 1843.

THE CHURCHMAN,
EDITED BY
THE REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.
And under the General Direction and Supervision of THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK, of whom it is the Official Organ of Communication with his Diocese.
It is published every SATURDAY for the Proprietors,
BY JAMES A. SPARKS,
109 Nassau-street, New York, UP STAIRS.

Its object is to disseminate religious intelligence, elucidate Christian doctrine, and explain and enforce the principles and precepts of evangelical piety.

For the proper and more effectual accomplishment of these objects, it is, as it ever has been, since its establishment in 1831, devoted to the interests, in every department, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to this end sets forth, elucidates, and when necessary defends, those principles and that policy, which have ever characterized the Diocese of New York, and by the divine blessing on which that Diocese has been enabled to maintain so much efficiency in promoting "THE UNITED INTERESTS OF THE GOSPEL AND THE CHURCH."

Communications intended for insertion should be addressed to the EDITOR, and letters on business to the PUBLISHER.

TERMS.—Three dollars per annum, payable in advance. No subscription received for less than six months; and none discontinued until arrearages are paid, and unless at the option of the Proprietors.

AGENTS.

Portsmouth, N. H., Rev. Charles Burroughs, D. D.,
" George M. Marsh.
Boston, Massachusetts, Charles Stimpson.
East Cambridge, Mass., Samuel R. Slack.
Providence, R. I., Burnett & Blodget.
Pawtucket, R. I., David Le Favour.
St. Albans, Vermont, G. G. Smith.
Quincy, Florida, Rev. Josiah Perry.
New Haven, Conn., Croswell & Jewett, booksellers.
Hartford, Conn., Henry S. Parsons.
Salisbury, Conn., Dr. William J. Barry.
Albany, N. Y., W. C. Little, Esq.
Catskill, N. Y., Charles B. Pinckney.
Saratoga Springs, N. Y., Stephen P. Nash, Esq.
Schenectady, N. Y., A. A. Van Voorst.
Troy, N. Y., Young & Hartt.
Lansingburgh, N. Y., Alexander Walsh, Esq. (gratis.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Ebenezer C. Arnold.
Newburgh, N. Y., William Purdy.
Auburn, N. Y., Thomas C. Miller.
Geneva, N. Y., Dr. A. F. Dodge.
Utica, N. Y., Isaiah Tiffany.
Watertown, N. Y., J. F. Hutchinson, Esq., P. M.
Unadilla, N. Y., A. B. Watson.
Oswego, N. Y., Henry Adriance.
Buffalo, N. Y., W. B. & C. E. Peck, booksellers.
Fayetteville, N. Y., D. L. Farnham, Esq.
Philadelphia, Pa., R. S. H. George, bookseller.
" George S. Appleton, do.
Newcastle, Delaware, H. J. Terry, Esq.
Baltimore, Md., Knight & Colburn.
Chaptico, Md., J. Biscoe, Post Office.
Princess Ann, Md., Wm. W. Johnston, Esq., P. M.
Alexandria, D. C., Bell & Entwistle.
Norfolk, Va., George Rowland, Esq.
Richmond, Virginia, Joseph Gill.
Wilmington, N. C., A. A. Brown, Esq.
Charleston, S. C., A. E. Miller.
Augusta, Georgia, G. McLaughlin.
Louisville, Kentucky, Solomon K. Grant.
Lexington, Ky., William Jucho.
Marietta, Ohio, Arius Nye.
Cleveland, Ohio, Lewis Handerson.
Quincy, Illinois, Henry H. Hoffman, Post Office.
Chicago, Illinois, John H. Kenzie, Esq.
Jackson, Michigan, P. E. Demill, Esq.
Homer, Michigan, Rev. E. O. Hodgkin.
St. Louis, Missiouri, David H. Armstrong.
Natchez, Mississippi, Brevoort Butler.
Mobile, Alabama, Samuel W. Raymond.
Halifax, N. S., Joseph H. Graham, bookseller.

POETRY.

For the Churchman.

The following lines were suggested by the recent illness and decease of one whose lovely character and shining qualities endeared her to many hearts; but whom the Almighty has seen fit to summon home to heaven before she had experienced the trials and difficulties of this earthly pilgrimage, or scarcely tasted of that bitter cup from which the lips of maturity *cannot* turn away:* —

So *soon* return'd, thou gloomy Messenger
From the mysterious, far off Spirit land?
Alas! in yonder dwelling, lingers yet
The echo of thy desolating step;
And still the dusky shadow of the grave
Is resting on its walls. O turn aside!
Nor quite obscure the feeble sunshine left.
Why wert thou sent to pluck another gem
From Hope's fair coronet? another flower
To rifle from the parent stem, that still
Hangs drooping o'er the bud so lately crush'd?
Forbear, thou fell Destroyer of our race!
To "break the bruised reed." This opening flower
Watch'd over with such fond solicitude;
Nourish'd so tenderly; so well beloved;
Leave yet awhile on our terrestrial soil.
We know its native place is in the skies;
We know that far too pure and delicate
Our cherish'd blossom for a world like this;
But human hearts are weak, and e'en the love
Most pure not all unselfish: Hard it is
To loose our hold of what we dearly prize,
Though Faith point upward to a brighter home,
Whose open door is waiting for the soul,
That struggles in the arms of earthly love,
To enter in and be forever bless'd.
Then spare that little band so fondly link'd
By Love's most holy tie—they *cannot* part:
The world is harsh and selfish, and her power,
Her mocking smile, and ever changing tone
Sicken the spirit and destroy its trust.
They have been wounded by her faithlessness,
And in each other's arms have sought the rest
Denied them on her cold capricious breast.
Heart has been knit to heart: and day by day
That sacred bond of union stronger grown,
And harder to be broken. Do not dim
The beauty of that silver chain, or force
With cruel hand its glittering links apart.
Revere the anguish of that stricken pair;
Pity those young, frail forms, that silently
Bend o'er the couch of suffering innocence,
With woe too deep for utterance.
Alas!
He will not heed affection's earnest prayer,
Death's unrelenting Angel! He has press'd
His icy hand upon that heaving breast,
And still'd the pulse of life. The throbbing brow
Grows cold as marble; and the ashy lips
Murmur a parting blessing ere they close—
The latest efforts of expiring love—
And all is over.
Leave them with the dead:—
For none may venture now to sympathize;
None offer comfort in an hour like this.
Let the o'erburden'd heart dissolve in tears;
The pent up agony, endured so long,
Burst forth at last—a heavy, heavy loss
Is theirs to mourn, and heaven forbids them not.
But when these bitter drops, now falling fast
Upon that lifeless form, are wiped away,
They can look calmly backward on the past,
And gratitude will mingle with regret
To mark the rainbow hues, the sunny smiles,
That light up memory's picture; no dark stain,
No guilty shadows to appal and grieve,
But pure and beautiful, the image there,
As yon blue heaven to which her soul has flown.
A peace the unquiet world can neither give
Nor take away, shall fill those sorrowing hearts.
A holy faith is theirs—a glorious hope,
Which raise the voyager on life's wide sea
Above the swell of its tumultuous waves
Which roar unceasingly around his path,
But cannot overwhelm. A little while
To bear with change and trouble; a few days
To journey o'er a fearful, dangerous path;
One fatal cup to drain, the last, the last
Of mortal suffering, and—the scene is closed—
All, all gone by, when dust returns to dust.
A brighter world shall open on the eyes
That closed in sadness here; another life,
All purity and bliss, will then begin.
The just shall meet again, to part no more.
The Serpent and his offspring Death, shall lie
Crush'd low beneath the conquering feet of Him
Who is "the Resurrection and the Life."
The blessed of the Lord, "the dead in Christ,"
Shall slumber sweetly till the final hour,
Then lay her down to rest. She yet shall live
Even *here* in faithful hearts: a thousand things
Shall call her back; those loving eyes
Now sealed in darkness, still shall mildly beam
With more than earthly radiance thro' their dreams;
And oft in "Memory's moonlight hour" the tones
Of that dear voice, like music from the land
Of perfect harmony, shall soothe their souls.
She is not lost. Around their daily paths
Her spirit, though unseen, may hover still;
Still, though they know it not, may sympathize
With the beloved of earth, still minister
With more than former tenderness; and still
Watch o'er and guide them in the way to Heaven.

Cooperstown, Nov. 30th, 1843. C. A. R.

* Mary M., daughter of the Rev. Frederick T. Tiffany, of Cooperstown, N. Y.

From the Commercial Advertiser.

THERE CANNOT BE A CHURCH WITHOUT A PRELATE.

FOURTH LETTER TO DR. WAINWRIGHT.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—Before I have concluded this letter in answer to yours of the 8th inst., our readers will have discovered that it is not my purpose to retard the discussion of your proposition, by insisting upon the merely technical question, who shall, by the laws of fence, commence the discussion. I will commence it; but in doing so, I mean to hold you strictly to the proposition you have thrown out as a defiance, and to keep yourself and our readers in mind that mine is an attitude of self-defence, against an assault, and an unprovoked assault, upon the character and rights of the great mass of our Christian fellow citizens.

In my last I think it was shown conclusively that this was the case. You seem to have a suspicion that the close of my letter, which indeed contained the gist of the matter, was well "adapted for my purpose or popular effect." You profess not indeed to see its *relevancy*, but I think others have not failed to perceive that my statement of the circumstances convicts you of having made a gratuitous attack upon all who do not think that Prelates only can open the gates of the Christian Church. "My purpose," I admit, was "popular effect;" and I feel complimented by your thinking that my argument has achieved my purpose. The reason of its fitness for "popular effect" is not to be found in any special skill upon my part in stating the facts, but in the nature of the facts themselves. In a simple matter of fact, the best judge is the common sense of common people. I perceive that you do not yourself call in question the force of my argument, that as there was confessedly nothing in Mr. Choate's language, and nothing in the applause of the audience, which invaded *your* ecclesiastical standing, so you were not called upon, especially upon that occasion, to attack the ecclesiastical standing of the general community of Christians.

You will understand me, however; I do not think that the inappropriateness of time and place is the worst feature in this case of ecclesiastical proscription. It is the utter unreasonableness and the unrelieved moral deformity of the unchurching dogma, which, in my view, constitute its offensive character. I admire boldness, but not in a bad cause; and I hold that to be, *prima facie*, a bad cause, which, either in the pulpit of one of your churches, or at the dinner table of the Astor House, prompts any man thus to assail the Church standing, including the faith, hopes and rights, of his fellow Christians. When you set up a claim, not to superiority, but to a *monopoly* of the privileges belonging to the house of God—when you set up this claim in behalf of a mere fraction, a molecule, of the Protestant community—and when such confessedly stupendous consequences are necessarily involved in the claim—it cannot escape the most unobservant reader, that to make out such a claim, its advocates ought to be prepared with proof, little short of *mathematical demonstration*. And yet, as I shall hereafter more fully show, the extravagance of the claim is equalled only by the contradictory, indefinite, and I must add the absolutely ridiculous character of many of the arguments which are employed to sustain it. This aggravates the unprovoked assault you have chosen to make, and if, in the course of my future remarks, I shall speak of the High Church dogma as it deserves, I shall hold myself absolved from blame as an aggressor.

Before I proceed to do for you, what you decline to do for yourself, i. e. define the terms of your own proposition so that the *reader* may understand them, (for I shall show you that I myself understand pretty well the sense you affix to them,) there are two little pieces of history, given in your last letter, which call for criticism.

The *first* is that in which you are giving an account of the origin of this discussion, for the purpose of "letting the public understand what are our respective positions." It runs thus:—"Upon leaving my study one morning, for the discharge of my parochial duties, I am informed in the street, to my great surprise, that a letter has been addressed to me in a public print by the Rev. Dr. Potts. It is put into my hand," &c. &c. This history wants the title-page, and a few of the first leaves. Will it not be better to supply the hiatus and begin at the beginning? It would be more complete if it commenced by recording the polite invitation which led you to the New England festival; the speech of the New England orator; the applause which accompanied him throughout, and which offended you so deeply, when he gave a sort of ecclesiastical genealogy of his forefathers; your determination to rebuke the orator and the audience, by declaring your belief, not that you had a better genealogy, but that their genealogy was absolutely spurious; your taking occasion two or three hours after, (when it might be supposed that you had had time for deliberation,) to avow that if the orator of the day should challenge you, you would prove that of the "clergy of New England," who had just been toasted, there were none justly entitled to the name, except "the sainted Cheverus," and the "meek Prelate of your own Church," with their several subordinates of the Papist and Protestant priesthood; that this attack upon the self respect and sensibilities of nineteen-twentieths, if not more, of your fellow citizens—I am almost afraid to say fellow Christians—was published throughout the land; and *then* that *after all this had come to pass*, and you had perhaps congratulated yourself that you had chastised Yankee impertinence—*then*—"upon leaving your study one morning," &c. &c. &c. Is not the record unfair until these few little items are prefixed to it? I will leave to the reader to say, whether the above be not the true genesis of the present discussion.

The *second* piece of history, which is open to animadversion more severe than I can administer, is that which informs us of the comparative antiquity, and universality of the motto which "you bear upon your shield:" "*No Church without a Prelate.*" At the very unqualified claim you make in respect to this motto I would express my *wonder, surprise, astonishment*, &c., &c., were I not tired of that common practice of disputants, a very efficient thing in rhetoric, but useless in logic. Whatever my wonder may be, I will not utter it. Besides which, after having seen how familiarity with extravagant statements often obliterates the intellectual sensibilities, just as a long familiarity with an offensive odor blunts the sense of smell, I have no longer a right even to feel surprise at the occurrence of such a phenomenon; no right to wonder that one, who had brought his mind to brave the consequences of the adoption of the unchurching dogma, should first of all find it easy to assert in a promiscuous company that Prelacy was of the very essence of the Church of God, and then subsequently, that this doctrine was "*borne on the banner of the Universal Church, without challenge or dispute*, 1600 *years.*" Now this *is* a wonderful statement. I might show that so far is this from being true, the doctrine of monopoly—as I shall call it for the sake of brevity, and to distinguish it from true catholicity—is not countenanced by the voice of antiquity, that there were writers who distinctly denied it, and whole Churches, the Waldensian for instance, which always refused even to admit the element of Prelacy into their constitution; and all this long before the glorious Reformation. This is unquestionable; but that the reader may not rely upon the assertion of one, who, he may suppose, "uses words at random," I will quote, from a disinterested witness, a single sentence; I will set the authority of the learned prelate Stillingfleet over against that of Dr. Wainwright. These are his words: "I do despair of finding one single testimony in all 'antiquity,' which doth in plain terms assert episcopacy as it was settled by the practice of the primitive Church, in ages following the Apostles, *to be of unalterable divine right.*" So much for the "unchallenged, undisputed" antiquity and universality of your motto.

But leaving these things for future consideration, I proceed to the most alarming part of your last communication—I mean that in which I am warned, in capital letters, of a horned dilemma which is goring me. It may be obtuseness in me, but I must confess I do not see these tremendous horns.

My "modest" call for your own definition of the terms of a proposition which you *volunteered* to maintain, and which is the basis of this discussion, was dictated by the wish to put *our readers* in possession of your meaning in your own words. As to myself I had a shrewd notion of their meaning. The proposition is capable of *two senses*; but from the very circumstances in which you announced it, I am myself at no loss as to your real meaning. But I have heretofore imagined that no discussion could be carried on without a mutual understanding as to the sense in which the parties mean to use the principal terms and phrases. How long is it since this apparently indispensable preliminary has been expunged from the laws of debate? Why you should manifest a reluctance "to commence the discussion by defining your terms," which is all I asked of you, is more than I will undertake to explain. But as you decline doing this, and as I must contrive some way of coming to an understanding as to the true *status quæstionis*, and the sense which our readers are to fix to its *terms*, I propose to waive even this right, and to do your work for you, rather than to waste time in an idle war of words. In doing this, I shall at the same time state wherein your definitions and mine differ in meaning.

First: What is the meaning of the word Church in your proposition? I am quite willing to take the definition of your own articles, which is as follows: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all things that are of necessity requisite to the same.'—Art. 19. This, however, does not fully express the high Church claims, inasmuch as it does not declare, (as it ought, if the doctrine of monopoly were true) that there cannot *be* a congregation of faithful men, and that the true word of God *cannot* be preached, nor the sacraments *duly administered*, &c., except under "the regimen of Prelates." This the framers of your articles studiously avoided saying, for it is well known that the English Reformers fraternized with the Reformed Churches of the continent of Europe. Since the time of Laud, however, the "no Prelate, no Church" dogma has been held by an increasing number of your communion, with more or less earnestness, although never without resistance upon the part of others, until it must be admitted that at the present time there is probably a majority of Anglican and American Prelatists, who hold the extreme views and maintain that Prelacy is,—not simply scriptural and useful, and therefore the best model of ecclesiastical polity—but *essential to the very being* of a Church.

Of this number you are one; and the following is the gloss you must put upon your Church article, just quoted. The Church is a congregation of faithful men, and the pure word of God is preached in it, and it alone has the sacraments duly administered, *because* it has Prelates, through whom, as the delegates of Christ, and the direct successors of the Apostles, the inferior orders of the ministry receive a right to preach and grace to administer Christian ordinances efficaciously. In other words, the statements of these extreme Prelatists warrant us in saying that though men may believe, teach and practice *all else* contained in the word of God, yet if they reject Prelacy, they are not in the Church of God at all, and if saved at all (of which some speak hopefully, but others doubtfully) must be saved "as by fire," upon some undefinable principles of mercy upon which nothing that is said in the Gospel will justify them in relying.

Do I misrepresent your views of the indispensableness of Prelacy to the very existence of a Church? If so, you could have prevented the possibility of misrepresentation, had you, according to my reasonable call, defined your terms in your own language. This you can still do.

Secondly: What is the definition of the office and functions of a "Bishop."

In your theory a Bishop is the highest of three grades of clergy:—Bishops, priests and deacons. He is set over a particular section or diocese, as its ecclesiastical head, and is invested with certain exclusive rights, which rights are thus stated by a Prelate: "The right to ordain and confirm, that of general supervision in a diocese, and that of the chief administration of discipline; besides enjoying all the powers of the other grades."—(Dr. H. U. Onderdonk.) In virtue of the last two of these rights, expressed with an indefinite comprehensiveness which we will examine at a subsequent stage in the discussion, the Prelate has been known even to claim a control over the proceedings and minutes of a Convention.

Farther, in order to the right institution of "a Bishop," in your sense of the term, he must have received his ordination from other Prelates, and they again from others, so that an unbroken chain may convey the Episcopal grace from the Apostles themselves. This is the far-famed Apostolical succession, of which so much has been made of late years. Why this chain is considered of such consequence may be seen by the reader if he will peruse the following quotations; two out of a multitude which I have at hand. The first is from a well-known champion of Prelacy, Dodwell, in the following *moderate* terms. I beg the particular notice of the reader. "None but the Bishops can unite us to the Father and the Son. Whence it will follow, that whosoever is disunited from the visible communion of the Church on earth, and *particularly* from the visible communion of the *Bishops*, must consequently be disunited from the whole visible Catholic Church upon earth; and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven, and, what is more, *from Christ and God himself*. It is one of the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the *damned*, that they are banished from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power. The SAME is their condition also who are disunited from Christ, by being disunited from *his visible representative*."

The former Prelate of this diocese, Dr. Hobart, in his "Companion for the Altar," speaks the following language; it is equally kind as the foregoing:—"But where the Gospel is proclaimed, communion with the Church, by the participation of its ordinances, at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood, is *the indispensable condition of salvation*,"—making a soothing exception in favor of schismatics and dissenters, who separate themselves from the regular priesthood through "*involuntary* ignorance and error."

I do not mean to discuss these monstrosities now, but will only add here that the ground upon which such assumptions are made is, that from the Apostles the Bishops alone derive Episcopal grace, which they communicate to the inferior clergy in ordination, and which, through the ministrations of the inferior clergy, is communicated to the people in baptism and the holy Eucharist, by the former of which a spiritual life is given, while by the latter that spiritual life is fed and sustained.

On the other hand, our definition of "a Bishop" makes him nothing more than a pastor or overseer of a particular congregation, who is, in all official respects, upon an equality with other pastors; who, in administering the discipline of the house of God, is associated with officers who are elected by the people, and who, in administering the ordinances of the Gospel, pretends to be no more than the ministrator of emblematic ordinances, whose virtue as seals of the covenant depends altogether upon the faith of the recipients. Ordination, whether with or without the imposition of hands, is no more than a public and formal setting apart of a suitable individual to the work of the ministry, and is performed by his predecessors in the ministry. The case of those Churches which have elected one out of the number of ministers to exercise certain supervisory powers over the rest, as is the fact in the Methodist and Lutheran Churches, is not an exception to the doctrine of the essential parity or equality of their ministers. These bodies do not claim a divine right for their Bishops or superintendents.

And now, finally, what do you mean by the Catholic Church? It is a phrase found in your former letters, and will probably occur again. I shall understand you to mean by it that portion of Christendom in which the above views as to the indispensableness of Prelacy are to be found. That is, you hold that the Prelatical bodies alone constitute the Catholic Church. The Romish, the Greek, the Armenian and other Eastern Churches, together with the English and American Prelatists, are the only component parts of this Church. And their catholicity, let the reader observe, consists not in purity of doctrine or forms of worship, (for you hold all those I have named, except your own, to be more or less corrupt;) but in their being governed by Prelates. This is the essential element of their catholicity, this their redeeming excellence, this their evidence of being "in covenant with God."

On the other hand, in *our* view of catholicity, you will find the main stress laid upon the maintenance of the essential doctrines of the scheme of redemption, and not upon the presence or absence of any external form of polity. We admit that even Prelacy does not vitiate the character of a Church, although we think it has proved itself to be a foreign and unwholesome element in the great Christian body. Thus, the reader will perceive that while our catholicity proves its comprehensiveness by embracing all of every name whose recognised creeds do not absolutely reject the fundamentals of Christian religion, yours renounces all who do not admit the single item of Prelacy. Which of these views best deserves the name, let the reader judge.

I close my letter by saying that if I had been privileged to meet you face to face, I should have exercised "the freedom" at which you seem to look with much distaste, of insisting at once upon your obligation to give these definitions of your terms, and thus have saved myself the task of trying to reach the point thus indirectly, and the necessity of *waiting* for your answer. If you refuse to give me your definitions, or to correct those I have given, I shall hold myself at liberty to consider you as shrinking from the contest.

All the skirmishing in your last communication, as to who is, technically speaking, the challenger, is of little consequence. I am resolved not to postpone the discussion of the monstrous proposition you have endorsed, by disputing as to who shall appropriate this title. I do not feel, I assure you, the least inclination to accept the "liberty to recede," which you kindly hint at, but will rather waive all petty questions of chivalry, quite certain that, from the beginning to the end of this discussion, it will be seen that mine is the attitude of defence, and yours that of an assailant of the common principles of all anti-Prelatical Christendom. This is the important consideration.

I am, Rev. and dear sir,
Your obd't servant,
Jan. 10. George Potts.

REV. DR. WAINWRIGHT TO REV. DR. POTTS.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—In concluding my last letter to you I said that I would not be either "enticed or driven from the position I occupied when you called upon me." Notwithstanding your pertinacious use of both these modes of controversial warfare, I stand there still, and *there* I mean to stand. You shall "hold me as strictly" as you please to the proposition I have thrown out. I wish to be held there. But you shall not hold me to assent to your charge that this proposition was thrown out "as a defiance," or that yours is the "attitude of self-defence against an unprovoked assault." I have denied this before—I deny it again—if repeated, I shall henceforth deny it as *a slander*. I uttered "no defiance." I attempted no "ecclesiastical proscription." I "unchurched" no denomination of Christians. God forbid that I, or any of those who symbolize with me in religious belief, should be guilty of such arrogance toward their fellow men; or, what is more dreadful, such bold assumption of the sole prerogative of God. The Church is His, and He has constituted it according to His own will. Those who do not conform to its requisitions unchurch themselves. Instead of all this stale declamation, so often repeated to excite popular prejudice—so often answered—PROVE from Scripture and ancient authors that Bishops are not essential to the constitution of the Christian Church, and then your work will be done, and effectually done. But until you have accomplished this, all the charges in which you so liberally indulge about "exclusiveness, uncharitableness, monopoly of privileges, unchurching," &c., are utterly irrelevant, and only calculated (I will not say designed) to divert the public mind from the true issue.

Enough of this, however. Let me recal you once more to your true position. In your letter of December 27th you say, "I will hold myself ready, (should you admit that the reporter of your speech has not done you injustice at least in this particular,) to prove that this proposition, (viz., there cannot be a Church, &c.,) is pregnant with innumerable evil consequences, social and civil; and that it is *unscriptural, uncharitable, schismatical*, and *anti-republican* in its character." I admit the correctness of the report. Issue is then joined, and what you have undertaken to prove is set forth in distinct and emphatic terms. You certainly will not say that you did not understand what you undertook to prove. You say, moreover, that "you are at no loss as to my real meaning." You have then laid your work out for yourself. Begin to execute it, if that is your pleasure. My part of the work I shall manage in my own way, and when I come to use terms I will leave you at no loss as to their meaning.

As to the "two little pieces of history" to which you allude, the first, in the modern department, is really too small a matter to make it worth my while to show how utterly disingenuous your representation is. As to the piece of ancient history, containing the allusion to the Waldenses, and to Bishop Stillingfleet, if you are indeed as ignorant as you appear to be on these points, and have implicitly followed Dr. Mason and Dr. Miller, without taking pains to acquaint yourself with the unanswered and unanswerable counter statements of Bishop Hobart and Dr. Bowden, I will, in due time, when the questions come up in their proper place, endeavor to throw some light upon them for your benefit.

My wish now is simply to let the public know, through my letter to you, as you avow that "popular effect" is your object, that to you are they indebted for this unfortunate, and I may add unworthy exhibition of two clergymen contending in the public newspapers about a question which has been discussed over and over again, and access to the ablest popular arguments upon both sides of which is very easy, by reason of the republication in cheap forms of "Miller's Letters," &c., "Bowden's Letters" in reply, and "Hobart's Apology for Apostolic order and its advocates." I assert that to you, and to you alone, is it owing that we are both placed in this, which I will cheerfully acknowledge to be "an unenviable position;" that to you is it owing that we are both subjected to the ribald remarks of licentious tongues and pens, and the sober disapprobation of a large portion of the secular press; that to you is it owing that our common friends and a large portion of the pious and sober-minded of all denominations feel deep regret and mortification. My course was inevitable. You challenged me to controversy upon the credit of a common newspaper report; you took no private and friendly means to ascertain its accuracy; when the circumstances of the case were laid before you, you refused to be convinced, and you still refuse. Your character and standing in the community were so respectable, that I should have been a traitor to my own, if I had shrunk even in thought from your defiance. I have met it, and I stand ready to abide all its consequences. You now yield the point we have thus far contended for, ungraciously as I cannot help thinking, but you yield it. You say you "will commence," and thus, with the affirmative, have assumed the responsibility of the aggressor and the defier. Proceed.

I beg you now proceed to the *proof*. And I take the liberty to beg you also to proceed upon the *purely scriptural and historical merits of the question*, and in a Christian spirit, avoiding, (as I for my part by God's help intend to do,) all personalities, all injurious epithets, and all appeals to mere prejudice and passion. Injurious epithets decide nothing; for if my doctrine should be God's truth what can they avail? Appeals to mere prejudice and passion decide nothing; they cannot put my doctrine in the wrong, any more than the universal clamor of all Ephesus put St. Paul's doctrine in the wrong. My views of Christian truth, you are bound to believe, are as sincerely and conscientiously held as your own. And wherever they are "*exclusive*" as toward yourself or others, I assert, (what certainly you have no right to deny,) that they are held in my own feelings as CHARITABLY as yours can be, where the latter are exclusive as toward various other highly respectable bodies of professing Christians. I have the honor to be, Rev. and dear sir, respectfully yours,

Jona. M. Wainwright.

Friday, Jan. 12th.

ORGAN MANUFACTORY, Anthony street, New York. Mr. JARDINE has the pleasure of submitting the following testimonial:

St. Albans, Vt., November 28, 1843.

Sir,—We feel it a privilege as well as a duty we owe you, that we award our testimony of very decided approbation and praise in favor of the Organ just built and erected by yourself in our Church edifice; presented to the church by the very generous and estimable lady of our worthy Rector, Mrs. Ann D. Hoit.

And we can assure you, dear sir, that in this, we have expressed the universal opinion of all who have listened to its most delightful and thrilling tones. The beauty of design, proportions, and style of finish, its full, rich, sweet and melodious tones, we are sure cannot be excelled in one of its size and variety.

Very respectfully,
Gardner G. Smith, S. P. Eastman, H. B. Sowles, Bildad Paull, } Wardens and Vestry of the Parish of Union Church, St. Albans.

To Mr. George Gardine, Organ Builder, New York.

The above Instrument is in a Black Walnut Case, of Gothic design—has two rows of Manuals, 14 stops, and Pedal Bass to CCC.

He begs to state that he has been awarded for the last six successive years the highest Premiums of the American Institute, for the best Organs.

And from his long experience as a practical finisher in this country, and also in two of the largest Organ Manufactories in London, he warrants his Organs fully equal, if not superior—and from 10 to 20 per cent cheaper than can be obtained elsewhere in this city.

A variety of Church and Parlor, and Church Barrel Organs constantly on hand. Dec. 9.

ORGANS.—The subscriber offers for sale the following Organs:—One Organ in a Grecian case, 10 feet 6 inches high, 6 feet 6 inches wide, and 3 feet 9 inches deep, with a general swell—compass of keys from GG. to F. in Alt. Stops as follows: Open Diapason, Stop Diapason Bass, Stop Diapason Treble, Principal Fifteenth and Trumpet; a pedal to take off the chorus stops.

Two Organs same as above with the exception, the compass of the keys from CC to F, in Alt—dimensions of case 9 feet 5 inches high, 6 feet wide, and 3 feet 6 inches deep.

A second hand Church Organ, 9 feet high, 5 feet 6 inches wide, and 3 feet deep.

A second hand Parlor Organ.

HENRY ERBEN,
Oct. 1—tf 172 Centre st., head of Canal st.

ORGAN BUILDING.—THOMAS HALL, (formerly of Philadelphia, and more recently of the firm of Hall & Erben,) Church and Parlor Organ Builder, informs his friends and the public, that he is prepared to execute orders for ORGANS of every description, at his Manufactory, No. 86 Wooster street, near Spring, at short notice, and at reduced prices.

From the long experience the subscriber has had in the business of Organ building, he flatters himself he can furnish instruments of a quality at least equal to the productions of any other builders in the United States. Orders for Tuning and Repairing punctually attended to.

THOMAS HALL,
No. 80 and 86 Wooster street,
Dec. 9—yly. near Spring.

TRINITY SCHOOL,
No. 76 Varick Street.
Rev. WILLIAM MORRIS, Rector.

THIS Institution consists of a Classical and an English Department.

In the former, pupils shall go through a thorough course of Classical and English Education.

In the latter, strict attention will be paid to the preparation of young gentlemen for commercial pursuits.

In both departments religious instruction shall be given, both of a general nature, and specially in the doctrines and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Academic Term consists of twelve weeks. Tuition fees payable in advance. No deduction for absence.

History, Elocution, Composition, Astronomy, Philosophy, Chemistry, Mathematics, Orthography, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography, and Grammar, ... $10 00
Latin and Greek, including the English course, 12 50
French, Spanish, &c., each, ... 5 00
Stationary, ... 0 50
Fuel for the season, ... 1 00

The 1st Term will commence Sept. 1, and end Nov. 23.
2d do. " Nov. 24, " Feb. 15.
3d do. " Feb. 16, " May 9.
4th do. " May 10, " July 31.

TRUSTEES.

Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D., President; Rev. Thomas Lyell, D. D.; Rev. William Berrian, D. D.; Rev. John McVickar, D. D.; Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D.; Rev. Joseph H. Price; Rev. Lot Jones; Rev. J. M. Wainwright, D. D.; Rev. T. H. Taylor, D. D.; Rev. B. I. Haight; Rev. E. Y. Higbee, D. D.; Thomas L. Ogden; Benjamin M. Brown; Murray Hoffman; Wm. H. Harison; Abel T. Anderson; John Stearns, M. D.; W. H. Hobart, M. D.; C. N. S. Rowland; Anthony J. Bleecker; John W. Mitchell. October 21.

TIRNITY CHURCH CEMETERY, AT MANHATTANVILLE.

THIS Cemetery is now ready for interments in graves or in vaults. It contains twenty-four acres of land, running from the Tenth Avenue to the Hudson River, and between 153d and 155th streets. The soil is of the best quality for the purpose, and to those who have not seen it, it may be necessary to say that the beauties of the place, and its rural and picturesque scenery, cannot be surpassed. The Tenth Avenue in front of the grounds has been opened, and a dock has been built on the river at the foot of 155th street. That portion of the grounds fronting the Tenth Avenue is intended for more immediate use for graves, vaults, and family burial places; but places for vaults can also be had, (if preferred,) in that portion nearest the river, which is covered with a fine open wood, and parts of it about 170 feet above high water descending gradually to the river.

Applications for interments should be made as early as convenient to Mr. Morison, Sexton, at the Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church streets. The prices for graves and for vaults and family burial grounds have been fixed at the lowest rate. For further information, and for the charges attending interments, apply to Mr. Morison as above. August 19—tf.

THE HISTORY OF A POCKET PRAYER-BOOK, written by itself. New edition. Just received and for sale by

JAMES A. SPARKS,
Nov. 11. Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau st.

ST. THOMAS' HALL, FLUSHING.

THE REV. WM. M. CARMICHAEL, D. D., Rector of St. George's Church, Hempstead, and GERARDUS BEEKMAN DOCHARTY, A. M., Principal of the Hempstead Seminary, having purchased the Institution known as ST. THOMAS' HALL, late the property of Reverend Francis L. Hawks, D. D., would respectfully inform their friends and the public generally, that they will reopen the same for the reception of students, on MONDAY, the 6th of November next, and that they will spare neither pains nor expense to render it in every way worthy of patronage.

Its elegant situation, the pleasantness and salubrity of the village in which it is located; its ready access at all times to the city of New York, are so well known that they need no comment.

For particulars in regard to terms, &c.—reference may be had to either of the Rectors at the Hall, or to the printed circulars, or by applying to any of the following gentlemen:

Rt. Rev. Benj. T. Onderdonk, D. D., New York.
Rev. Dr. Taylor, Rector of Grace Church.
Rev. Dr. Ogilby, Prof. in the Theological Seminary.
Rev. Dr. Seabury, Editor of the Churchman.
Rev. Dr. Moore, Richmond, Staten Island.
Hon. David S. Jones, New York.
Messrs. S. D. Skillin, D. Clarkson, Dr. Lucius Comstock, O. T. & J. Hewlett, Swords & Stanford, New York.
Messrs. Jarvis Brush, A. Van Nostrand, Brooklyn.
Rt. Rev. Henry U. Onderdonk, D. D., Philadelphia.
Rev. Dr. Ducachet, "
Rev. Dr. Coleman, "
Rev. Frederic Ogilby, "
Rt. Rev. William R. Whittingham, D. D., Baltimore. October 28.

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,
Depository, No. 20 John Street, New York.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

Union Primer, perhundred,			$3 00
Prot Epis S S Book, No. 1, per hundred			1 38
" " " 2,	"		1 75
" " " 3,	"		2 00
" " " 4,	"		5 00
Questions on the S S Books.	"		5 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,) per hun.			1 38
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"		2 50
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"		10 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,)	"		5 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"		3 00
Church Catechism,	"		1 25
First Truths,	"		2 50
Duty to God,	"		0 50
Church Primer,	"		1 38
Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"		10 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"		1 75
Harmony of the Creeds,	"		2 25
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"		2 25
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"		2 00
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"		10 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"		25 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"		8 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2, stiff covers,	"		10 00
Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament,	"		20 00
" " Vol. 2, New do	"		22 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers,	"		10 00
" " 2, "	"		9 00
" " 3, "	"		10 00
Questions on The Acts, 1, "	"		10 00
" " 2, "	"		9 00
" " 3, "	"		8 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child,	"		2 50

A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

The Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Library, 76 vols. 18mo.—nett price 20 cents each.

The same, bound in 139 volumes of various prices.—Total, $18 90 nett.

The Children's Magazine, bound in 28 volumes of 144 pages each, price for the set, $5 80 nett.

The Juvenile Library, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 85 cents nett.

Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to
Daniel Dana, Jr., Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John st.
New York, March 18, 1843.

THE CHURCHMAN,
EDITED BY
THE REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.
And under the General Direction and Supervision of
THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,
of whom it is the Official Organ of Communication with his Diocese.
It is published every SATURDAY for the Proprietors,
BY JAMES A. SPARKS,
109 Nassau-street, New York, up stairs.

Its object is to disseminate religious intelligence, elucidate Christian doctrine, and explain and enforce the principles and precepts of evangelical piety.

For the proper and more effectual accomplishment of these objects, it is, as it ever has been, since its establishment in 1831, devoted to the interests, in every department, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to this end sets forth, elucidates, and when necessary defends, those principles and that policy, which have ever characterized the Diocese of New York, and by the divine blessing on which that Diocese has been enabled to maintain so much efficiency in promoting "The united interests of the Gospel and the Church."

Communications intended for insertion should be addressed to the Editor, and letters on business to the Publisher.

TERMS.—Three dollars per annum, payable in advance. No subscription received for less than six months; and none discontinued until arrearages are paid, and unless at the option of the Proprietors.

AGENTS.

Portsmouth, N. H., Rev. Charles Burroughs, D. D.,
" George M. Marsh.
Boston, Massachusetts, Charles Stimpson.
East Cambridge, Mass., Samuel R. Slack.
Providence, R. I., Burnett & Blodget.
Pawtucket, R. I., David Le Favour.
St. Albans, Vermont, G. G. Smith.
Quincy, Florida, Rev. Josiah Perry.
New Haven, Conn., Croswell & Jewett, booksellers.
Hartford, Conn., Henry S. Parsons.
Salisbury, Conn., Dr. William J. Barry.
Albany, N. Y., W. C. Little, Esq.
Catskill, N. Y., Charles B. Pinckney.
Saratoga Springs, N. Y., Stephen P. Nash, Esq.
Schenectady, N. Y., A. A. Van Voorst.
Troy, N. Y., Young & Hartt.
Lansingburgh, N. Y., Alexander Walsh, Esq. (gratis.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Ebenezer C. Arnold.
Newburgh, N. Y., William Purdy.
Auburn, N. Y., Thomas C. Miller.
Geneva, N. Y., Dr. A. F. Dodge.
Utica, N. Y., Isaiah Tiffany.
Watertown, N. Y., J. F. Hutchinson, Esq., P. M.
Unadilla, N. Y., A. B. Watson.
Oswego, N. Y., Henry Adriance.
Buffalo, N. Y., W. B. & C. E. Peck, booksellers.
Fayetteville, N. Y., D. L. Farnham, Esq.
Philadelphia, Pa., R. S. H. George, bookseller.
" George S. Appleton, do.
Newcastle, Delaware, H. J. Terry, Esq.
Baltimore, Md., Knight & Colburn.
Chapico, Md., J. Biscoe, Post Office.
Princess Ann, Md., Wm. W. Johnston, Esq., P. M.
Alexandria, D. C., Bell & Entwistle.
Norfolk, Va., George Rowland, Esq.
Richmond, Virginia, Joseph Gill.
Wilmington, N. C., A. A. Brown, Esq.
Charleston, S. C., A. E. Miller.
Augusta, Georgia, G. McLaughlin.
Louisville, Kentucky, Solomon K. Grant.
Lexington, Ky., William Jucho.
Marietta, Ohio, Arius Nye.
Cleveland, Ohio, Lewis Handerson.
Quincy, Illinois, Henry H. Hoffman, Post Office.
Chicago, Illinois, John H. Kenzie, Esq.
Jackson, Michigan, P. E. Demill, Esq.
Homer, Michigan, Rev. E. O. Hodgkin.
St. Louis, Missouri, David H. Armstrong.
Natchez, Mississippi, Brevoort Butler.
Mobile, Alabama, Samuel W. Raymond.
Halifax, N. S., Joseph H. Graham, bookseller.